arXiv:1612.08138v1 [math.PR] 24 Dec 2016

An analytic BPHZ theorem for Regularity Structures

December 28, 2016

Ajay Chandra and Martin Hairer

University of Warwick, UK
Email: A.Chandra@Warwick.ac.uk, M.Hairer@Warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

We prove a general theorem on the stochastic convergence of appropriately renormalized models arising from nonlinear stochastic PDEs. The theory of regularity structures gives a fairly automated framework for studying these problems but previous works had to expend significant effort to obtain these stochastic estimates in an ad-hoc manner.

In contrast, the main result of this article operates as a black box which automatically produces these estimates for nearly all of the equations that fit within the scope of the theory of regularity structures. Our approach leverages multi-scale analysis strongly reminiscent to that used in constructive field theory, but with several significant twists. These come in particular from the presence of "positive renormalizations" caused by the recentering procedure proper to the theory of regularity structure, from the difference in the action of the group of possible renormalization operations, as well as from the fact that we allow for non-Gaussian driving fields.

One rather surprising fact is that although the "canonical lift" is of course typically not continuous on any Hölder-type space containing the noise (which is why renormalization is required in the first place), we show that the "BPHZ lift" where the renormalization constants are computed using the formula given in [BHZ16], *is* continuous in law when restricted to a class of stationary random fields with sufficiently many moments.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Setting, preliminary definitions, and the main theorem **8**
2.1 Space-time scalings, types, and homogeneities 9
2.2 Trees, forests, and decorations 10
2.3 Regularity structures of semi-decorated trees 12
2.4 Probabilistic assumptions and the main theorem 16

3 Renormalization of combinatorial trees and random fields **21**
3.1 Colorings, a new decoration, more homogeneities, and identified forests . . 21
3.2 Co-actions and twisted antipodes 23

3.3 From combinatorial trees to space-time functions 27
3.4 The BPHZ renormalized tree 28

4 A forest and cut expansion for the BPHZ renormalized tree 28
4.1 A forest formula for negative renormalizations 28
4.2 A cutting formula for positive renormalizations 39
4.3 An explicit formula for the BPHZ renormalized tree 46
4.4 From the BPHZ renormalized tree to the BPHZ model 49
4.5 An example 52

5 Reorganizing sums 54

6 Multiscale expansion 57

7 The projection onto safe forests and choosing positive cuts 60

8 Summing over scales 65
8.1 Interchanging the sum over scales and intervals 65
8.2 Summing over scales inductively 66
8.3 Estimates on renormalization 68
8.4 Full control over a single tree 84

9 Moments of trees and proof of the main theorem 86

A Multiscale Clustering 93
A.1 Multiscale clustering for a single tree 93
A.2 Multiscale clustering for cumulants 99
A.3 Multiscale clustering for Wick contractions 102

B Symbolic index 110

1 Introduction

The theory of regularity structures [Hai14] presents a systematic and robust methodology for interpreting / solving a wide class of parabolic stochastic partial differential equations (SPDEs). One natural subclass of such SPDEs are equations of the type

$$(\partial_t - \mathcal{L})\varphi = F(\varphi, \zeta)\,, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\mathcal{L}$ is an elliptic differential operator (think of the standard Laplacian on d-dimensional space $\mathbf{R}^d$ or the d-dimensional torus $\mathbf{T}^d$) and $F(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a local nonlinearity that depends on less derivatives of φ than $\mathcal{L}$. The solution $\varphi(t,x)$ can be formally thought of as a random space-time field $\varphi : \mathbf{R}^{d+1} \to \mathbf{R}$, and ζ is a random space time field, the prototypical example being given by space-time white noise, the centred Gaussian generalised random field satisfying $\mathbf{E}[\zeta(t,x)\zeta(s,y)] = \delta(t-s)\delta(x-y)$.

Equations like (1.1) can formally be obtained as limits of the dynamics of classical models of statistical mechanics in suitable regimes. Two intensely studied examples are the KPZ equation appearing from the evolution of random interfaces, where $F(\varphi,\zeta) = |\nabla\varphi|^2 + \zeta$, and the Φ^4_d equation appearing from limits of dynamical Ising models, where $F(\varphi,\zeta) = -\varphi^3 + \zeta$.

An important restriction on the class of equations that [Hai14] is able to treat is *local subcriticality* - a precise definition of this condition is fairly technical[1] but heuristically it states that all non-linear terms appearing on the right hand side of (1.1) behave like perturbations of the noise term as one rescales the equation towards smaller scales and that these perturbations can be written as multi-linear functionals of the solution to the corresponding linear equation (where $F(\varphi, \zeta) = \zeta$).

An immediate obstacle to rigorously formulating these SPDEs is that the roughness of the driving noise ζ forces the solution φ to live in a distributional space with insufficient regularity to allow one canonically define $F(\varphi, \zeta)$. As with any other integration theory, the program of giving a rigorous solution theory to such SPDEs entails understanding how to define these solutions as limits of well-defined approximate solutions.

To obtain such well-defined approximations we can convolve the driving noise with some smooth approximate identity ϱ_ε with $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varrho_\varepsilon(\cdot) = \delta(\cdot)$. It is then typically easy to obtain, for every realization of ζ, a local existence theorem for

$$(\partial_t - \mathcal{L})\varphi_\varepsilon = F(\varphi_\varepsilon, \zeta_\varepsilon) \, , \tag{1.2}$$

where $\zeta_\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \zeta * \varrho_\varepsilon$. Naively one would hope to define the solution of (1.1) via the limit $\varphi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varphi_\varepsilon$ - unfortunately it is generic for this limit to fail to exist and this signals the need to *renormalize*. The process of renormalization entails prescribing a scheme of modifying the nonlinearity F at each value of ε, giving a family of non-linearities $F_\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot)$, such that if one considers the modified equations

$$(\partial_t - \mathcal{L})\hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon = F_\varepsilon(\hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon, \zeta_\varepsilon) \, , \tag{1.3}$$

then the space-time functions $\hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon$ will converge in probability, as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, to a non-trivial limiting space-time distribution φ. The need for renormalization can be seen very explicitly when one uses Picard iteration to replace the non-linearity F with a formal expansion in terms of multilinear functionals of the linear solution.

We now give a detailed presentation of this for the specific case where $F(\varphi, \zeta) = \varphi^3 + \zeta$ and $d = 3$. We write G for the space-time Green's function of the differential operator $(\partial_t - \mathcal{L})$. Then, using Picard iteration, one obtains a formal expansion of the RHS of (1.2)

$$\begin{aligned}(\partial_t - \mathcal{L})\varphi_\varepsilon =& \zeta_\varepsilon + (G * \zeta_\varepsilon)^3 + 3[G * (G * \zeta_\varepsilon)^3](G * \zeta_\varepsilon)^2 \\ &+ 3[G * (G * \zeta_\varepsilon)^3]^2 (G * \zeta_\varepsilon) + [G * (G * \zeta_\varepsilon)^3]^3 + \cdots\end{aligned}$$

where $*$ denotes space-time convolution. Observe that $G * \zeta_\varepsilon$ is nothing but the solution to the linear equation underlying (1.2). Some simple graphical notation borrowed from [Hai14][2] clarifies this expansion - using this for the first three terms

[1] See [BHZ16, Sec. 5] for a formal definition with a wider scope (it also incorporates systems of equations) than the somewhat informal definition given in [Hai14].

[2] This graphical notation is more than a minor convenience - developing a formalism for seeing all these multilinear functionals of ζ as combinatorial objects allows us to describe various complicated operations with full precision in great generality.

of the RHS gives

$$(\partial_t - \mathcal{L})\varphi_\varepsilon = \bullet_\varepsilon + \Psi_\varepsilon + 3\Psi\!\!\Psi_\varepsilon + \cdots \ . \tag{1.4}$$

As $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ the second two objects on the RHS (and infinitely many others hiding in the "$\cdots$") will not converge for generic realizations of ζ. However, one can switch to a stochastic point of view and see that the $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ limits of the space-time functions

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Psi}_\varepsilon &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Psi_\varepsilon - 3\, C_{\text{V}}^\varepsilon \, \uparrow_\varepsilon \\ \widehat{\Psi\!\!\Psi}_\varepsilon &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Psi\!\!\Psi_\varepsilon + 3\,(C_{\text{V}}^\varepsilon)^2 \, \diagdown_\varepsilon - C_{\text{V}}^\varepsilon \, \Psi_\varepsilon - 3 C_{\text{V}}^\varepsilon \, \Lambda_\varepsilon - 3 C_{\Psi\!\!\Psi}^\varepsilon \, \uparrow_\varepsilon \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

exist for *almost every* realization of ζ, where the limit will be a space-time distribution, provided that we set

$$C_{\text{V}}^\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{E}[\text{V}_\varepsilon(0)] \ \text{ and } \ C_{\Psi\!\!\Psi}^\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{E}[\Psi\!\!\Psi_\varepsilon(0)] - (C_{\text{V}}^\varepsilon)^2 \int_{\mathbf{R}^4} G(z)\, dz \ .$$

We also extended our graphical notation by setting

$$\begin{aligned} \text{V}_\varepsilon &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (G * \zeta_\varepsilon)^2 \ , \\ \Psi_\varepsilon &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} G * (G * \zeta_\varepsilon)^3 \ , & \diagdown_\varepsilon &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} G * (G * \zeta_\varepsilon) \ , \\ \Lambda_\varepsilon &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [G * (G * \zeta_\varepsilon)^2](G * \zeta_\varepsilon) \ , & \Psi\!\!\Psi_\varepsilon &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [G * (G * \zeta_\varepsilon)^2](G * \zeta_\varepsilon)^2 \ , \end{aligned}$$

and used the notation $\tau_\varepsilon(0)$ to indicate we are evaluating the space-time function τ_ε at $z = 0$.

This ε-dependent subtraction of "counterterms" on individual terms of our formal expansion (1.4) to make each term convergent as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ is reminiscent of the *perturbative renormalization* developed for Quantum Field Theory (QFT)[3].

Making these individual terms convergent is only part of the procedure of perturbative renormalization, the other is rewriting the nonlinearity F so that the needed counterterms are automatically generated in the Picard iteration. If, in (1.3), we set $F_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon, \zeta_\varepsilon) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varphi_\varepsilon^3 - c_\varepsilon \varphi_\varepsilon + \zeta_\varepsilon$, where $c_\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 3C_{\text{V}}^\varepsilon + 9C_{\Psi\!\!\Psi}^\varepsilon$, then, generating an expansion like (1.4) for $\hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon$ and collecting terms appropriately, one will see

$$(\partial_t - \mathcal{L})\hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon = \bullet_\varepsilon + \widehat{\Psi}_\varepsilon + 3\widehat{\Psi\!\!\Psi}_\varepsilon + \cdots \ , \tag{1.6}$$

where all the divergent terms we did not explicitly write down are also organized with counterterms so that (1.6) is an infinite expansion where each individual term, for almost every realization of ζ, is convergent as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

This analysis of formal expansions is an old story - a systematic procedure for choosing these counterterms is the BPHZ formalism [BP57, Hep69, Zim69] which can be adapted from perturbative QFT to "perturbative SPDE". Unfortunately, this analysis at the level of formal series falls far short of showing that once suitably renormalized, the actual solutions $\hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon$ converge to a limit $\hat{\varphi}$. This proved to be

[3] One important difference is that the perturbative renormalization in QFT is carried out on expectation values, or "amplitudes", not stochastic objects.

a difficult problem until the publication of [Hai14] which was followed by an enormous amount of progress in the field.

We now summarize the approach of the theory of regularity structures. To motivate this approach we first observe that the $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ limits of the left hand sides of (1.5), which we denote by $\widehat{\Psi}$ and $\widehat{\Psi\Psi}$, are probabilistic limits which are measurable functions of ζ. Adopting a deterministic approach, they will not be, in any reasonable topology, continuous functions of ζ. Following this thread, if we denote by $\zeta \mapsto \varphi(\zeta)$ the "solution map" that takes a realization of the driving noise to the corresponding solution to the SPDE (1.1) then it seems natural to expect that $\varphi(\cdot)$ will not be continuous either - this is discouraging since we would want to define $\varphi(\zeta)$ for typical realizations of ζ by setting $\varphi(\zeta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} \varphi(\zeta_\varepsilon)$.

The theory of regularity structures does not view φ as the primary solution map and rather works with a map defined on a much richer space. It replaces the (linear) space of realizations of ζ with a non-linear metric space $\mathscr{M}_0$ of objects called *models* which encode, loosely speaking, the realization of ζ *and* sufficiently many multilinear functionals of $G * \zeta$ so that one can approximate F sufficiently well.

In order to describe the elements of the space $\mathscr{M}_0$, one must go further then just specifying a realization of each such multi-linear functional. Additionally, one must also specify, for every space-time point z, a suitable method of recentering this functional around z so that the recentered functional satisfies certain analytic bounds close to that point z. This recentering is performed via the subtraction of z-dependent counterterms[4] and can be interpreted as a type of "positive renormalization", see [BHZ16]. Moreover, the definition of the space $\mathscr{M}_0$ enforces analytic and highly non-trivial algebraic constraints on how these z-dependent counterterms depend on z - the latter constraints are responsible for the non-linearity of the space $\mathscr{M}_0$.

Note that all of this analysis is completely deterministic - in order to make it stochastic we will work with model-valued random variables. The reward for this increase in complexity is that the map from a model $Z \in \mathscr{M}_0$ to the solution $\Phi(Z)$ of the equation "driven" by the Z is continuous.

At first sight, it is not clear why this would be of any help. Indeed, there is a natural "naive" way of defining a family of models $(Z^{\zeta_\varepsilon}_{\text{can}})_{\varepsilon,\zeta}$ so that the solution $\varphi(\zeta_\varepsilon)$ to (1.2) is given by $\Phi(Z^{\zeta_\varepsilon}_{\text{can}})$. Viewing ζ as random, $(Z^{\zeta_\varepsilon}_{\text{can}})_{\varepsilon,\zeta}$ is then a sequence of random models but, for essentially the same reasons as above, this sequence fails to converge in $\mathscr{M}_0$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

The reason why this perspective is still useful is that there is more than one way of associating a model to a given realisation of the driving noise. In particular, it turns out that the renormalisation procedure which was required then in order to make the terms in the formal series expansion converge can be encoded into a suitable definition of what we mean by "the model Z_ε associated to ζ_ε". More precisely, there is a probabilistically convergent family of models $(Z^{\zeta_\varepsilon}_{\text{BPHZ}})_{\varepsilon,\zeta}$ such

[4]These counterterms have no obvious counterpart in perturbative renormalization for QFT.

that, for each fixed ζ, the solution $\hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon(\zeta_\varepsilon)$ to (1.3), with our choice of F_ε, is given by $\Phi(Z^{\zeta_\varepsilon}_{\text{BPHZ}})$. Thanks to the deterministic continuity of the map $Z \mapsto \Phi(Z)$ it follows that the probabilistic convergence of the models $Z^{\zeta_\varepsilon}_{\text{BPHZ}}$ is inherited by $\hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon(\zeta_\varepsilon)$. Writing $Z^{\zeta}_{\text{BPHZ}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} Z^{\zeta_\varepsilon}_{\text{BPHZ}}$, one can view $\Phi(Z^{\zeta}_{\text{BPHZ}})$ as "a solution" to the SPDE at hand[5]

While the machinery of [Hai14] was formulated systematically and covered a wide class of SPDEs, two tasks in this procedure were left to be dealt with in a somewhat ad-hoc way:

1. Create a concrete space of models $\mathscr{M}_0$ tailor-made so that the type of SPDEs at hand can be realized as one driven by a model in $\mathscr{M}_0$. This space should have enough flexibility to allow for the renormalization subtractions needed to yield probabilistically convergent families of models.
2. Find a probabilistically convergent family of random models Z^{ζ}_{ε}.

A systematic approach for the first task has recently been presented in [BHZ16]. In particular, given a random, smooth, driving noise ζ the space of models described by [BHZ16] is rich enough to include the BPHZ renormalized random model Z^{ζ}_{BPHZ} defined in [BHZ16, Eq. 6.22], see also [Hai16, Eq. 3.1].

The goal of the present article is to prove the following implication: if a family of random smooth driving noises ζ_n converges in an appropriate sense as $n \to \infty$ then this automatically implies the stochastic L^p convergence of the random models $Z^{\zeta_n}_{\text{BPHZ}}$. The trio of papers [Hai14], [BHZ16], and the present article then give a completely automatic black box for obtaining local existence theorems for a wide class of SPDEs.

We now describe the approach and outline of this paper. As already mentioned, there are two types of renormalization that appear here - negative renormalizations which compensate for divergences and base-point dependent positive renormalizations which appear in our recentering procedure. The definition of the BPHZ model found in [BHZ16] and [Hai16] invokes two maps called the positive and negative twisted antipodes. Each of these maps is defined through a recursive formula. A very similar (in spirit) definition is given in Section 3 which is later to shown to coincides with the definition given in [BHZ16] and [Hai16].

Our first step is to obtain a more explicit integral formula for the BPHZ renormalized model in terms of a sum over forests and cuts, and this is the content of Section 4. Here the forests come from negative renormalization and are really the same as those of Zimmerman's forest formula [Zim69] - they are families of divergent structures where each pair of structures in each family must be either nested or disjoint. The cuts correspond to locations of positive renormalizations.

The most fundamental obstacle that appears when estimating this explicit integral formula is that renormalizations can obstruct each other. This can happen in two

[5] We do not say "the solution" because there will actually be an infinite family of solutions. This degeneracy can be seen in our example - one would expect $\hat{\varphi}_\varepsilon$ to converge for any choice of the form $F_\varepsilon(\varphi, \zeta) = \varphi^3 - (c_\varepsilon + c_1)\varphi + c_2 + \zeta$ where c_1 and c_2 are finite constants. The full space of solutions to a given locally subcritical SPDE will always be parameterized by a finite number of real parameters.

ways: (i) two negative renormalizations can obstruct each other if the two divergent structures are neither nested nor disjoint (ii) two renormalizations of opposite sign can obstruct each other if they overlap, that is a positive renormalization might occur within a divergent structure. As a result, one cannot in general expect to be able to "harvest" all cancellations created by the two renormalization procedures.

The first problem is the famous problem of overlapping divergences of perturbative quantum field theory. Its solution comes from using scale decompositions so that, for any given scale assignment, one can identify which one of a pair of overlapping divergent structures to renormalize. The original approach to this problem was to represent the explicit formula in terms of Fourier variables and splitting up the Fourier integration domain into "Hepp sectors". The resulting estimates can be summarised by the mantra that "overlapping divergences don't overlap in phase-space".

The use of momentum space techniques is too limiting for our purposes. However an alternative approach in position space was described in [FMRS85], where one expands the kernels associated to the lines of a Feynman diagram into an infinite sum of slices, each of which is localized at a particular length scale. A full scale assignment is an assignment of scale to every single line of a Feynman diagram. For each full scale assignment on a Feynman diagram, the authors of [FMRS85] define an operator on the set of Zimmerman forests for that diagram called the "projection onto safe forests". This allows for the sum over Zimmerman forests to be re-organized, as a function of the scale assignment, into sums over subsets of forests we call "intervals". With this reorganization one is guaranteed to harvest the right negative renormalizations for each given scale assignment.

The problem of overlaps between positive and negative renormalizations does not appear in perturbative QFT, but it turns out that it also does not cause a problem. One can show that if one chooses appropriately which cuts to harvest, as a function of scale assignments, then the larger sum over forests and cuts can also be reorganized appropriately for each scale assignment. The mantra here is that "positive and negative renormalizations don't overlap in phase-space".

The set-theoretic aspects and notation of forest projections and intervals, how they can be used to reorganize sums over forests, and sufficient conditions (which we call "compatibility") for the sum over forests and sum over cuts to interact well are all described in Section 5. This is all done abstractly, then in Section 6 we present our multiscale expansion procedure. In Section 7 we make the notions of Section 5 concrete: we present, as a function of each scale assignment, the [FMRS85] forest projection, our algorithm for choosing which cuts to harvest, and the proof that these two notions are compatible.

In Section 8 we describe how one inductively controls the nested renormalization cancellations that might appear and we obtain full control over one copy of the BPHZ renormalized model. When estimating these nested renormalizations we use seminorms similar to ones introduced in [FMRS85] but simplified. In Section 9 we state and verify conditions which take as input the control over a single copy of the model that we obtained in Section 8 and then gives as output estimates on higher

moments of that model.

One key generalization in this work is that we do not assume Gaussianity of the driving noise distribution. This was already done earlier in [HS15, CS16, SX16] but the novelty here is that we are able to also accommodate very weakly mixing space-time random fields and genuinely non-Gaussian situations[6].

We are also able to deal with driving noises more singular than space-time white noise but are still restricted to regimes where the solution to the corresponding linear equation and the multilinear functionals of that solution which appear in our analysis must have regularity strictly better than space-white noise in regularity. This limitation was already seen in the works [CQ02, FV10, Hos16, HHL$^+$15]. The reason for this is that the objects indexed by trees that are being renormalised in the theory of regularity structures should really be thought of as "half Feynman diagrams", with the full diagram arising in the moment estimates by gluing together several trees by their leaves, see for example [Hai13]. The analogue of the BPHZ renormalisation procedure arising in our context however takes place at the level of the trees, not at the level of the resulting Feynman diagrams, so that divergent structures straddling more than one of the constituent trees cannot be taken into account, thus leading to divergencies. This is not a mere technical problem but points to a genuine change in behaviour of the corresponding stochastic PDEs, as already seen in [CQ02] in the context of rough paths, where SDEs driven by fractional Brownian motion can only be made sense of for Hurst parameters $H > \frac{1}{4}$, even though the theory of rough paths should in principle "work" all the way down to $H > 0$. The works [MU11, MU12] suggest that even if there is a "canonical" rough path corresponding to fractional Brownian motion with $H \leq \frac{1}{4}$, one would expect it to live over a larger probability space, so that the Lévy area is no longer a measurable function of the underlying path. In the genuinely non-Gaussian case, our analysis points to a similar problem already arising at $H = \frac{1}{3}$ in the case of non-vanishing third cumulants.

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to Abdelmalek Abdesselam, Yvain Bruned, Kurusch Ebrahimi-Fard, and Lorenzo Zambotti for many interesting discussions on the subject of this article. MH gratefully acknowledges support by the Leverhulme Trust and by an ERC consolidator grant.

2 Setting, preliminary definitions, and the main theorem

The most primitive object of the theory of [Hai14] is the *regularity structure* $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{G})$. In [BHZ16] a very general formulation for the construction of regularity structures is given by defining various algebraic spaces of trees and forests and taking progressive quotients/projections. In this section, we introduce some of the objects and notations from [BHZ16].

[6] As an example, we can accommodate a driving noise which is given by a Wick power of the linear solution to the stochastic heat equation.

2.1 Space-time scalings, types, and homogeneities

For the rest of the paper we fix a dimension $d \geq 1$ of space-time. For a multi-index $k = (k_i)_{i=1}^d \in \mathbf{N}^d$ we define the degree of k to given by

$$|k| \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{d} |k_i| \ . \tag{2.1}$$

Most interesting SPDE falling under our framework have underlying linear equations which scale anistropically with respect to the various components of space-time - for example the stochastic heat equation underlying (1.1) scales *parabolically*.

A d-dimensional space-time "scaling" is a multi-index $\mathfrak{s} = (\mathfrak{s}_i)_{i=1}^d \in \mathbf{N}^d$ with strictly positive entries. From here on we treat the space-time scaling $\mathfrak{s}$ as fixed.

For $z = (z_1, \dots, z_d) \in \mathbf{R}^d$ we do not define $|z|$ to be given by the standard Euclidean norm but instead set

$$|z| \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{d} |z_i|^{\frac{1}{\mathfrak{s}_i}} \ . \tag{2.2}$$

There appears to be a bad overload of notation between (2.2) and (2.1) but it will always be clear from context whether the argument of $|\cdot|$ is a multi-index or a space-time vector.

While $|\cdot|$ on $\mathbf{R}^d$ is not a norm it certainly defines a metric. With this metric the space $\mathbf{R}^d$ has Hausdorff dimension $|\mathfrak{s}|$ - in particular the function $|z|^\alpha$ on $\mathbf{R}^d$ is locally integrable at $z = 0$ if and only if $\alpha > -|\mathfrak{s}|$.

We introduce a notion of $\mathfrak{s}$-degree for multi-indices $k = (k_i)_{i=1}^d \in \mathbf{Z}^d$ by setting

$$|k|_{\mathfrak{s}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{d} k_i \mathfrak{s}_i \ .$$

This induces a notion of $\mathfrak{s}$-degree for polynomials on $\mathbf{R}^d$ - for $k \in \mathbf{N}^d$ the $\mathfrak{s}$-degree of a monomial $\mathbf{R}^d \ni z \mapsto z^k$ is $|k|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and the $\mathfrak{s}$-degree of a polynomial is the maximum maximum among the the $\mathfrak{s}$-degree's of its monomials (with the $\mathfrak{s}$-degree of the 0 polynomial set to $-\infty$).

2.1.1 Types and homogeneities

The combinatorial trees we introduce should be thought of as arising, in spirit, from Picard iteration of the mild formulation system of SPDEs one is trying to solve. As we saw in the introduction, for (1.1) one obtains trees where the edges correspond to convolution with the kernel G and the leaves correspond to the driving noise.

To accomodate systems of equations we work with a collection of different convolution kernels and driving noises. To formalize this we fix, for the rest of the article, a finite set of *types* $\mathfrak{L}$ which comes with a partition $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}_+ \sqcup \mathfrak{L}_-$. The elements of $\mathfrak{L}_+$ and $\mathfrak{L}_-$ are respectively called kernel types and noise types.

Definition 2.1 A homogeneity assignment is a map $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}} : \mathfrak{L} \to \mathbf{R}$ such that

$$\mathfrak{L}_+ = \{\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{L} : \ |\mathfrak{t}|_{\mathfrak{s}} > 0\} \ \text{ and } \ \mathfrak{L}_- = \{\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{L} : \ |\mathfrak{t}|_{\mathfrak{s}} < 0\} \ .$$

A choice of homogeneity assignment should be considered fixed except in a few specific arguments where we explicitly state this is not case.

For each $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{L}_+$, $|\mathfrak{t}|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ quantifies the regularizing effect of the corresponding kernel. On the other hand, for $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{L}_-$, $|\mathfrak{t}|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ encodes the regularity of the driving noise corresponding to $\mathfrak{t}$.

For any set A and map $\mathfrak{t} : A \to \mathfrak{L}$, we write $|\mathfrak{t}(A)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{a \in A} |\mathfrak{t}(a)|_{\mathfrak{s}}$. Given a homogeneity assignment $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ we extend it to $\mathbf{Z}^d \oplus \mathbf{Z}(\mathfrak{L})$ by setting

$$a = k + \sum_{\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{L}} c_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathfrak{t} \in \mathbf{Z}^d \oplus \mathbf{Z}(\mathfrak{L}) \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad |a|_{\mathfrak{s}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |k|_{\mathfrak{s}} + \sum_{\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{L}} c_{\mathfrak{t}} |\mathfrak{t}|_{\mathfrak{s}} \ .$$

2.2 Trees, forests, and decorations

2.2.1 Trees

A rooted tree T is an acyclic finite connected simple graph with a distinguished vertex ϱ_T which we call *the root*. This graph can be presented as a set of nodes N_T and edges $E_T \subset N_T^2$. Since we force our trees to have roots it follows that $\varrho_T \in N_T \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand we do allow $E_T = \emptyset$ which forces $|N_T| = 1$; such a tree will be called *trivial* and is also denoted by $\bullet$.

We view the node set N_T of a rooted tree T as being equipped with a partial order $\leq$ where $u \leq v$ if and only if u lies on the unique path connecting v to the root. We then view T as being directed, with every edge being of the form $(u, v) \in E_T$ with $u < v$. With this convention, the root of T is the unique vertex with no incoming edges. We define maps $e_{\mathrm{c}}, e_{\mathrm{p}} : E_T \to N_T$ with the property that for any $e \in E_T$ one has $e = (e_{\mathrm{p}}(e), e_{\mathrm{c}}(e))$ - here c stands for "child" and p stands for parent. When e has been fixed for an expression we may write e_{p} and e_{c}, suppressing the argument. Note that we inherit a poset structure on edges by setting $e \leq \tilde{e} \Leftrightarrow e_{\mathrm{p}} \leq \tilde{e}_{\mathrm{p}}$.

An morphism of rooted trees T and $\bar{T}$ is a map $f : N_T \sqcup E_T \to N_{\bar{T}} \sqcup E_{\bar{T}}$ with the property that for any $e = (x, y) \in E_T$ one has $f(e) = (f(x), f(y)) \in E_{\bar{T}}$.

A typed rooted tree is a pair $(T, \mathfrak{t})$ where T is a rooted tree and $\mathfrak{t} : E_T \to \mathfrak{L}$ with the properties that (i) if for some $e \in E_T$ one has $\mathfrak{t}(e) \in \mathfrak{L}_-$ then e is maximal in the partial order on E_T and (ii) For distinct $e, \ e' \in E_T$ with $\mathfrak{t}(e), \mathfrak{t}(e') \in \mathfrak{L}_-$ one has $e_{\mathrm{p}} \neq e'_{\mathrm{p}}$.

A morphism of typed rooted trees is morphism of rooted trees which preserves edge types. The type map $\mathfrak{t}$ is often suppressed from from notation. Henceforth the term "tree" denotes a typed rooted tree.

2.2.2 Forests

A typed rooted forest F is a typed directed graph (consisting of a node set N_F, an edge set $E_F \subset N_F^2$, and a type map $\mathfrak{t} : E_F \to \mathfrak{L}$) with the property that every

connected component of F is a typed rooted tree (we often call each of these components a "tree" of F). Henceforth the term "forest" will always refer to a typed rooted forest.

Clearly any typed rooted tree is also a typed rooted forest. We do allow for $N_F = \emptyset$ in the definition of a forest and this empty forest will be denoted by $\mathbf{1}$. Note that $\mathbf{1}$ is *not* a tree. We also write $\varrho(F) \subset N_F$ for the collection of all nodes of F having no incoming edges. Additionally, we view N_F and E_F as posets by inheriting the poset structures from their connected components of F and postulating that pairs of edges / vertices belonging to different connected components are not comparable. We say $f\colon N_F \sqcup E_F \to N_{F'} \sqcup E_{F'}$ is a typed rooted forest morphism from F to F' if it restricts to a morphism of rooted trees on each connected component.

One has the decomposition $E_F = K(F) \sqcup \mathbb{L}(F)$ where

$$\mathbb{L}(F) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{e \in E_F : \mathfrak{t}(e) \in \mathfrak{L}_-\} \text{ and } K(F) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{e \in E_F : \mathfrak{t}(e) \in \mathfrak{L}_+\} .$$

We call the elements of these two sets *noise edges* and *kernel edges*, respectively. While viewing noises as edges was the point of view taken in [BHZ16], where it leads to a cleaner description of the algebraic properties of these objects, it will be much more natural in the present setting to view each noise as a node. We will therefore always restrict ourselves to situations in which, for any given node $v \in N(F)$, there can be at most one kernel edge $e \in \mathbb{L}(F)$ with $e_{\mathrm{p}} = v$. As a consequence, we will never work with $\mathbb{L}(F)$, but instead with the set $L(F) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e_{\mathrm{p}}[\mathbb{L}(F)]$. Observe that, thanks to the above-mentioned restriction, $L(F)$ naturally inherits a type map $\mathfrak{t} : L(F) \to \mathfrak{L}_-$. We also define a subset of nodes $N(F) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} N_F \setminus e_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{L}(F))$ which should be thought of as "true" nodes (they are the ones that will later on correspond to integration variables) and consider the elements of $e_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{L}(F))$ as "fictitious" nodes that will not play any role in the sequel. We also use the shorthand $\tilde{N}(F) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} N(F) \setminus \varrho(F)$. The reason why this shorthand will often be used is that, when renormalizing a subtree S of a larger tree T, one should think of "contracting" this subtree to a single node, see [Hai14, BHZ16]. We will then always identify the integration variable corresponding to the contraction of S with the root of S in T, so that $\tilde{N}(S)$ precisely corresponds to the variables that get integrated out by the renormalization procedure.

We often include figures representing trees and forests. To keep things simple our pictures will only distinguish between kernel type and noise type: edges of kernel type will be depicted by straight arrows and edges of noise type will be depicted by a zigzag line, as in the following figure.



The arrow for an edge e always travels from e_{p} to e_{c}. Above we have marked the true vertices with solid circles and the fictitious nodes with open circles, with the root being drawn as a larger green dot.

We define the *forest product* $F_1 \cdot F_2$ between two forests F_1 and F_2 as their disjoint union. Since there is no ordering on the set of components of a forest, the forest product is commutative and associative with the empty forest $\mathbf{1}$ serving as unit. Given a forest F we say that a forest A is a subforest of F if $N_A \subset N_F$, $E_A \subset E_F$ and the natural inclusion map $\iota : N_A \sqcup E_A \to N_F \sqcup E_F$ is a forest morphism. In particular, the empty forest $\mathbf{1}$ is a subforest of every forest. We define $\mathrm{Conn}(F)$ to be the set of connected components of F, each viewed as a subtree of F (thus $\mathrm{Conn}(F)$ may contain distinct elements which are isomorphic as trees).

Two subforests A and B of a forest F are said to be disjoint if $N_A \cap N_B = \emptyset$. We also define the union $A \cup B$ and intersection $A \cap B$ of two subforests A, B of F to be the subforests with node and edge sets $N_A \cup N_B$, $E_A \cup E_B$, and $N_A \cap N_B$, $E_A \cap E_B$, respectively. If B is a subforest of A such that $B \cap A$ consists of a union of connected components of A then $A \setminus B$ is also a subforest. A subforest that happens to be a tree is called a subtree. Both the intersection and the union of a non-disjoint pair of subtrees is again a subtree.

2.2.3 Decorations

A semi-decorated tree consists of a tree T and two maps: a node label $\mathfrak{n} : N(T) \to \mathbf{N}^d$ and an edge label $\mathfrak{e} : E_T \to \mathbf{N}^d$. Given a forest T, node decoration $\mathfrak{n}$ and edge decoration $\mathfrak{e}$ on T we denote the corresponding semi-decorated tree by $T^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}}$.

A choice of homogeneity assignment $|\cdot|_s$ induces a notion of a homogeneity for semi-decorated trees by setting

$$|T^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{e \in E_T} \left(|\mathfrak{t}(e)|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{e}(e)|_{\mathfrak{s}}\right) + \sum_{u \in N(T)} |\mathfrak{n}(u)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \; . \tag{2.3}$$

2.3 Regularity structures of semi-decorated trees

2.3.1 The reduced regularity structure

We first recall the definition of a regularity structure from [Hai14, Def. 2.1].

Definition 2.2 A *regularity structure* $\mathscr{T} = (A, \mathcal{T}, G)$ consists of

- An index set $A \subset \mathbf{R}$ which is locally finite and bounded from below.
- A model space T, which is a graded vector space $\mathcal{T} = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in A} \mathcal{T}_\alpha$, with each $\mathcal{T}_\alpha$ a Banach space.
- A *structure group* G of linear operators acting on $\mathcal{T}$ such that, for every $\Gamma \in G$, every $\alpha \in A$, and every $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$, one has

$$\Gamma\tau - \tau \in \bigoplus_{\beta < \alpha} \mathcal{T}_\beta \; .$$

When formulating our main theorem in the context of the theory of regularity structures the relevant regularity structure will be the *reduced regularity structure* $\mathscr{T}$ described by the recipe of [BHZ16, Section 6.4][7]. This recipe takes as input a choice of space-time dimension $d \geq 1$, a d-dimensional space-time scaling $\mathfrak{s}$, sets of leaf and kernel types $\mathfrak{L}_+$ and $\mathfrak{L}_-$, a homogeneity assignment $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ on these types, and finally a *rule* R. We have introduced all these notions except the last one.

The vector space $\mathcal{T}$ of the reduced regularity structure is the free vector space generated by a well chosen collection $B_\circ$ of semi-decorated trees. Then one has $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{|T_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} : T_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n}} \in B_\circ\}$ and for each $\alpha \in A$ one sets $\mathcal{T}_\alpha$ to be the free vector space generated by all semi-decorated trees $T_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n}} \in B_\circ$ with $|T_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} = \alpha$.

Remark 2.3 The collection $B_\circ$ introduced in [BHZ16] is slightly different than the one introduced here since it furthermore allows a tree to be endowed with an additional colored subforest, as well as an additional label $\mathfrak{o}$ which keeps track of some information coming from contracted subtrees. The collection $B_\circ$ we are using here consists of those elements for which $\mathfrak{o} = 0$ and the colored subforest is empty. This is because we will only ever consider the *reduced regularity structure* introduced in [BHZ16, Sec. 6.4].

This collection $B_\circ$ has to be rich enough to describe the solution to the system of SPDEs in question and be closed under positive and negative renormalization operations. A natural method to build $B_\circ$ so that this is the case is to build it up inductively by starting from some primitive objects and then applying operations like integration and point-wise products. We describe this now.

For every $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{L}_+$ and $k \in \mathbf{N}^d$ we define an operator $\mathcal{I}_{\mathfrak{t}}^k[\cdot]$ on semi-decorated trees as follow: for an arbitrary semi-decorated tree τ one obtains $\mathcal{I}_{\mathfrak{t}}^k[\tau]$ by adding a new vertex to the set of vertices of τ which becomes the new root and has a vanishing node label - we then attach the new root to the old one with an edge of type $\mathfrak{t}$ and edge decoration k.

Additionally, for any $\mathfrak{l} \in \mathfrak{L}_-$ we write $\Xi_{\mathfrak{l}}$ for the semi-decorated tree which consists of a single edge of type $\mathfrak{l}$ with vanishing edge and node labels. We also introduce a commutative and associative binary operation on semi-decorated trees called the tree product: for two semi-decorated trees τ and $\bar{\tau}$, the tree product $\tau \star \bar{\tau}$ is obtained by identifying the roots of τ and $\bar{\tau}$, which becomes the root of $\tau \star \bar{\tau}$, and then setting the new node label of this root to be the sum of the node label of the two previous roots.

The set of primitive semi-decorated trees we start with is $\{\bullet^n\}_{n \in \mathbf{N}^d} \sqcup \{\Xi_{\mathfrak{l}}\}_{\mathfrak{l} \in \mathfrak{L}_-}$ - the first set is called the set of "abstract polynomials" and the second is called the set of "abstract noises". Then, one builds up $B_\circ$ by applying tree products and applying the operators $\mathcal{I}_{\mathfrak{t}}^k$. However, this produces a collection $B_\circ$ which is too large - certainly A will fail to be bounded below. A *rule* is then an algorithm which explicitly specifies when one is allowed to take tree products and apply the operators $\mathcal{I}_{\mathfrak{t}}^k$ as one builds $B_\circ$. For a precise definition of what a rule is we point

[7] This is a generalisation of the more informal prescription of [Hai14, Section 8].

the reader to [BHZ16, Section 5.2]. For the present article, this precise definition is irrelevant, one should think of a rule as a way of formalising what one means by a "class of semilinear stochastic PDEs" and $B_\circ$ as the set of trees that are required when trying to formulate elements from that class within the theory of regularity structures. A rule is then "subcritical" if all elements in the corresponding class of SPDEs are subcritical in the sense of [Hai14]. It is "complete" if the class is sufficiently large so that it is closed under the natural renormalisation operations described in [BHZ16]. We now fix a for the rest of the paper a complete subcritical rule R and a corresponding reduced regularity structure $\mathcal{T}$.

Remark 2.4 For example, if we wish to consider the stochastic PDE formally given by

$$\partial_t \Phi = \Delta \Phi - \Phi^3 + \xi \, ,$$

in dimension $d < 4$ and for ξ space-time white noise, then the smallest complete rule allowing to describe this equation contains all equations of the type

$$\partial_t \Phi = \Delta \Phi - P(\Phi) + \xi \, ,$$

where P is a polynomial of degree 3.

2.3.2 Admissible models

Next we recall the definition of a smooth model on a regularity structure $\mathscr{T}$. In what follows we denote by $\mathscr{C}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ the space of all smooth real valued functions on $\mathbf{R}^d$.

Definition 2.5 Given a regularity structure $\mathscr{T} = (A, \mathcal{T}, G)$, a smooth model $Z = (\Pi, \Gamma)$ on $\mathscr{T}$ on $\mathbf{R}^d$ with scaling $\mathfrak{s}$ consists of

- A map $\Gamma : \mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R}^d \to G$ such that $\Gamma_{xx} = \mathrm{Id}$, and such $\Gamma_{xy}\Gamma_{yz} = \Gamma_{xz}$ for all $x, y, z \in \mathbf{R}^d$.
- A collection $\Pi = (\Pi_x)_{x \in \mathbf{R}^d}$ of continuous linear maps $\Pi_x : \mathcal{T} \to \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d)$ such that $\Pi_y = \Pi_x \Gamma_{xy}$ for all $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^d$.

Furthermore, for every $\alpha \in A$ and every compact set $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathbf{R}^d$, we assume the existence of a finite constant $C_{\alpha,\mathfrak{K}}$ such that the bounds

$$|(\Pi_x \tau)(y)| \le C_{\alpha,\mathfrak{K}} \|\tau\|_\alpha |x - y|^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Gamma_{xy}\tau\|_\beta \le C_{\alpha,\mathfrak{K}} \|\tau\|_\alpha |x - y|^{\beta - \alpha} \tag{2.4}$$

hold uniform in $x, y \in \mathfrak{K}$, $\beta \in A$ with $\beta < \alpha$, and $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$. Here for any $\beta \in A$, $\|\cdot\|_\beta$ denotes the norm on the Banach space T_α.

Above, there is no constraint how a model interacts with the various kernel types, noise types, and edge labels - to do this one introduces an "admissibility" condition. This requires associating to each abstract kernel type a concrete convolution kernel.

First, following [Hai14, Section 10.3], for any $\zeta \in [0, -|\mathfrak{s}|)$ and $m \in \mathbf{N}$ we introduce norms $\|\cdot\|_{\zeta,m}$ on smooth functions $K : \mathbf{R}^d \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbf{R}$ by setting

$$\|K\|_{\zeta,m} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{\substack{k \in \mathbf{N}^d \\ |k|_\mathfrak{s} \le m}} \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}^d \setminus \{0\}} |x|^{\zeta + |k|_\mathfrak{s}} |D^k K(x)| \, . \tag{2.5}$$

Definition 2.6 A *kernel type map* is a tuple $K = (K_{\mathfrak{t}})_{\mathfrak{t}\in\mathfrak{L}_+}$ where for every $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{L}_+$

- $K_{\mathfrak{t}} : \mathbf{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ is smooth function.
- $K_{\mathfrak{t}}(x)$ vanishes if $|x| > 1$.
- For every $m \in \mathbf{N}$ one has $\|K_{\mathfrak{t}}\|_{|\mathfrak{t}|_{\mathfrak{s}},m} < \infty$.

Remark 2.7 Within the scope of regularity structures it is common to also require that for some value of $r > 0$ one has $\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} K_{\mathfrak{t}}(x)P(x)\,dx = 0$ for any polynomial P of $\mathfrak{s}$-degree strictly less than r. Since there is no need for this in any of the theorems stated in this paper we do not enforce any such requirement.

For the rest of the paper we take our kernel type map K as fixed.

With all these notions in hand we can now give a definition of an admissible smooth models.

Definition 2.8 A smooth model $Z = (\Pi, \Gamma)$ is said to be admissible it satisfies all of the following properties.

- For every $z, \bar{z} \in \mathbf{R}^d$, $\Pi_z[\bullet^0](\bar{z}) = 1$.
- For any $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{L}_+$, $k \in \mathbf{N}^d$ and $\tau \in B_\circ$ such that $\mathcal{I}_{\mathfrak{t}}^k(\tau) \in B_\circ$ one has

$$(\Pi_z\mathcal{I}_k^{\mathfrak{t}}(\tau))(\bar{z}) = (D^k K_{\mathfrak{t}} * \Pi_z\tau)(\bar{z}) - \sum_{|j|_{\mathfrak{s}}<|\mathcal{I}_{\mathfrak{t}}^k(\tau)|_{\mathfrak{s}}} \frac{(\bar{z}-z)^j}{j!}(D^{k+j}K_{\mathfrak{t}} * \Pi_z\tau)(z)\,,$$

  for all $z, \bar{z} \in \mathbf{R}^d$. Here $*$ denotes convolution in $\mathbf{R}^d$ and j denotes a multiindex in $\mathbf{N}^d$.
- For any $n \in \mathbf{N}^d$, $z, \bar{z} \in \mathbf{R}^d$, and $\tau \in B_\circ$ such that $\bullet^n \star \tau \in B_\circ$, one has

$$(\Pi_z[\bullet^n \star \tau])(\bar{z}) = (\bar{z} - z)^n(\Pi_z\tau)(\bar{z})\,.$$

We denote by $\mathscr{M}_\infty$ the collection of all smooth admissible models on $\mathscr{T}$. The notion of a model is formulated at a deterministic level. When formulating a system of SPDEs as a system "driven" by a model, each realization of the noise yields a different model.

If we turn to solving an SPDE like (1.2) then there is a canonical way to lift each smoothened realization of the driving noise to a corresponding model, which we describe now.

Definition 2.9 A *noise type map* is a tuple $\xi = (\xi_{\mathfrak{t}})_{\mathfrak{t}\in\mathfrak{L}_-}$ with $\xi_{\mathfrak{t}} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for every $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{L}_-$. We denote by Ω_∞ the set of all noise type maps for our fixed set of types $\mathfrak{L}_-$.

Given a noise type map, there is a canonical way of associating a model to it.

Definition 2.10 Given $\xi \in \Omega_\infty$, the *canonical lift* $Z_{\text{can}}^\xi = (\Pi, \Gamma) \in \mathscr{M}_\infty$ of ξ is the unique admissible model such that

- for every $\mathfrak{l} \in \mathfrak{L}_-$ and $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$ one has $(\Pi_z \Xi_{\mathfrak{l}})(\cdot) = \xi_{\mathfrak{l}}(\cdot)$,
- for every $z, \bar{z} \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and $\tau, \bar{\tau} \in B_\circ$ with $\tau \star \bar{\tau} \in B_\circ$,

$$(\Pi_z[\tau \star \bar{\tau}])(\bar{z}) = (\Pi_z \tau)(\bar{z}) \cdot (\Pi_z \bar{\tau})(\bar{z}) \, .$$

Reiterating what was said in the introduction, for a fixed realization of ζ_ε, the equation (1.2) will be viewed as driven by the model $Z^{\zeta_\varepsilon}_{\text{can}}$ and the solution $\varphi(\zeta_\varepsilon)$ can be written in terms of $\Phi(Z^{\zeta_\varepsilon}_{\text{can}})$ where $Z \to \Phi(Z)$ is defined on $\mathscr{M}_\infty$.

Next, we describe the topology that makes Φ *continuous* - to do this we define a family of pseudometrics on $\mathscr{M}_\infty$ as follows. For $(\Pi, \Gamma),\ (\bar{\Pi}, \bar{\Gamma}) \in \mathscr{M}_\infty$, $\alpha \in A$, and compact $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathbf{R}^d$, we define

$$|\!|\!|(\Pi, \Gamma); (\bar{\Pi}, \bar{\Gamma})|\!|\!|_{\alpha, \mathfrak{K}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\Pi - \bar{\Pi}\|_{\alpha; \mathfrak{K}} + \|\Gamma - \bar{\Gamma}\|_{\alpha; \mathfrak{K}} \tag{2.6}$$

where

$$\|\Pi - \bar{\Pi}\|_{\alpha; \mathfrak{K}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup \left\{ \frac{|\langle (\Pi_x - \bar{\Pi}_x)\tau, \varphi^\lambda_x \rangle|}{\|\tau\|_\alpha \lambda^\alpha} : \begin{array}{l} x \in \mathfrak{K},\ \tau \in \mathscr{T}_\alpha \\ \lambda \in (0,1],\ \varphi \in \mathscr{B}. \end{array} \right\},$$

$$\|\Gamma - \bar{\Gamma}\|_{\alpha; \mathfrak{K}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup \left\{ \frac{\|(\Gamma_{xy} - \bar{\Gamma}_{xy})\tau, \varphi^\lambda_x\|_\beta}{\|\tau\|_\alpha \cdot |x - y|^\alpha} : \begin{array}{l} x, y \in \mathfrak{K},\ x \neq y, \\ \tau \in \mathscr{T}_\alpha, \beta \in A, \beta < \alpha. \end{array} \right\}.$$

Endowing $\mathscr{M}_\infty$ with the system of pseudometrics $(|\!|\!|\bullet; \bullet|\!|\!|_{\alpha, \mathfrak{K}})_{\alpha, \mathfrak{K}}$, we can view $\mathscr{M}_\infty$ as a metric space. The space $\mathscr{M}_\infty$ is certainly not complete - we denote by $\mathscr{M}_0$ the completion of $\mathscr{M}_\infty$. Elements of $\mathscr{M}_0$ are called admissible models - they include models which are *distributional* in character.

Viewing the map $\Phi(\cdot)$'s target space as an appropriate Holder-Besov space of distributions one can prove estimates that show Φ admits a unique extension to $\mathscr{M}_0$. However at this point we have reached the limit of what one can do with a purely pathwise analysis. As we stated in the introduction, if one fixes a realization of ζ then the deterministic convergence of ζ_ε to ζ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ cannot be turned into a similar statement about convergence of the canonical lifts $Z^{\zeta_\varepsilon}_{\text{can}}$ - the latter objects will in general not converge in $\mathscr{M}_0$.

2.4 Probabilistic assumptions and the main theorem

Switching to a probablistic approach, even when one views ζ as a random noise type map and the $Z^{\zeta_\varepsilon}_{\text{can}}$ as model-valued random variables one in general does not have any probablistic convergence of the latter objects - one may still need to renormalize.

Before stating our main theorem guaranteeing this can be done we formalize the stochastic setting we are working in.

Definition 2.11 We say that an Ω_∞-valued random variable ξ is *acceptable* if

1. For every $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$, $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{L}_-$ and $k \in \mathbf{N}^d$, the random variable $D^k \xi_{\mathfrak{t}}(z)$ has finite moments of all orders, with its first moment vanishing.

2. The law of ξ is invariant under the action of $\mathbf{R}^d$ on Ω_∞ given by translations.

We denote by $\mathcal{M}(\Omega_\infty)$ the set of all acceptable Ω_∞-valued random variables. These random variables are assumed to be defined on some underlying probability space Ω and, when needed, we write ω for an element of Ω. We will however mostly follow usual custom in suppressing the dependence on ω from our notations.

Given $\xi \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_\infty)$ we will describe below in (3.5) and (4.27) how to construct what we call the "BPHZ renormalized lift" of a realization $\xi(\omega)$, henceforth denoted by $Z^{\xi(\omega)}_{\text{BPHZ}}$. We will also see in Lemma 4.23 below that this construction is equivalent to that given in [Hai16, Eq. 3.1] and [BHZ16, Thm 6.17]. Note that this object depends both on a specific realisation $\xi(\omega)$ and on the distribution of ξ. We write Z^{ξ}_{BPHZ} for the corresponding model-valued random variable.

The outline of this section is as follows. Mirroring our discussion of models, we will view $\mathcal{M}(\Omega_\infty)$ as a subset of a larger space of random distributions $\mathcal{M}(\Omega_0)$. We will then introduce some quantitative tools for looking at these random distributions which allow us to show that a notion of probabilistic "convergence" of a sequence $(\xi_n)_{n\in\mathbf{N}} \subset \mathcal{M}(\Omega_\infty)$ yields stochastic L^p convergence of the corresponding BPHZ models $(Z^{\xi_n}_{\text{BPHZ}})_{n\in\mathbf{N}}$.

2.4.1 Quantitative estimates on cumulants

Our quantitative assumptions on the driving noise all involve their *cumulants*. Throughout the paper, for any (multi)set B of real-valued random variables with finite moments of all orders defined on some underlying probability space Ω, we write $\mathbf{E}^c[B]$ for the joint cumulant of the elements of B. Recall that, writing $\mathbf{E}[B]$ as a shorthand for the expectation of the product of all elements of B, the cumulant is defined recursively by the identities $\mathbf{E}^c[\emptyset] = 1$ and then $\mathbf{E}[B] = \sum_{\pi\in\mathcal{P}(B)} \prod_{A\in\pi} \mathbf{E}^c[A]$, where $\mathcal{P}(B)$ denotes the set of all partitions of B into disjoint subsets, see for example [GJ87, Sec. 13.5].

We introduce the "large diagonal" of the set $\mathbf{R}^{dN}$ of configurations of N points in $\mathbf{R}^d$ by

$$\text{Diag}_N \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in \mathbf{R}^{dN} : \exists 1 \le i < j \le d \text{ with } x_i = x_j\} .$$

While we allow for our random driving noises to be quite singular we impose some strong, but natural, regularity assumptions on their cumulants - this is encoded via the following notion.

Definition 2.12 Suppose that, for $N \ge 2$, we are given a collection[8] $\{\zeta_n\}_{n=1}^N$ of $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbf{R}^d)$-valued random variables that each have moments of all orders, invariant in joint law under the natural action of $\mathbf{R}^d$ on this collection given by simultaneous translation, and are all defined on the same probability space.

We say that such a collection *admits pointwise cumulants* if there exists a distribution $F \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbf{R}^{dN})$ with the singular support of F contained in Diag_N (we

[8]This collection may be a multiset in that the same random variable may appear more than once.

denote by $F(x)$ the corresponding function, which is smooth away from Diag_N) and satisfying, for every collection of test functions $f_1, \dots, f_N \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ the identity

$$\mathbf{E}^c[\{\zeta_n(f_n)\}_{n=1}^N] = F(f_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes f_N) \tag{2.7}$$

where $(f_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes f_N)(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{n=1}^N f_n(x_n) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}^{dN})$.

As part of this definition, we also enforce two regularity conditions, one on second cumulants and the other on higher cumulants. When $N = 2$, translation invariance guarantees that there exists $\tilde{F} \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbf{R}^d)$ such that for every $f, g \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbf{R}^d)$ one has

$$F(f \otimes g) = \tilde{F}(f * \tilde{g}) \tag{2.8}$$

where $\tilde{g}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g(-x)$ and $*$ denotes convolution. Note that the singular support of $\tilde{F}$ is given by $\{0\}$. We then require that for any $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}^d)$, one has

$$\tilde{F}(f) = \sum_{|k|_{\mathfrak{s}} < |\mathfrak{s}|/3} \tilde{F}(\bullet^k) \frac{D^k f(0)}{k!} + \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} dy \, \Big(f(y) - \sum_{|k|_{\mathfrak{s}} < |\mathfrak{s}|/3} \frac{D^k f(0)}{k!} y^k \Big) \tilde{F}(y) \, ,$$

with k denoting multiindices in $\mathbf{N}^d$ and $\bullet^k$ denoting the function $z \mapsto z^k$. On the other hand, for $N \geq 3$, we enforce that $F(x)$ be a locally integrable function on $\mathbf{R}^{dN}$ and for the distribution F to be given by integration against $F(x)$.

For a collection $\{\zeta_n\}_{n=1}^N$ admitting pointwise cumulants F as above, we will write $\mathbf{E}^c[\{\zeta_n(x_n)\}_{n=1}^N]$ for the value $F(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ (provided that $x \notin \mathrm{Diag}_N$) and $\mathbf{E}^c[\{\zeta_n\}_{n=1}^N]$ for the distribution F.

Definition 2.13 We define $\mathcal{M}(\Omega_0)$ to be the set of all $\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{L}_-} \mathcal{S}'(\mathbf{R}^d)$-valued random variables ξ that satisfy the following properties.

- For every $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{L}_-$ and $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbf{R}^d)$, $\xi_{\mathfrak{t}}(f)$ has moments of all orders.
- The law of ξ is stationary under the action of $\mathbf{R}^d$ on $\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{L}_-} \mathcal{S}'(\mathbf{R}^d)$ by translation.
- For every $N \geq 2$ and any map $\mathfrak{t} : [N] \to \mathfrak{L}_-$ the collection of generalised random fields $\{\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(n)}\}_{n=1}^N$ admits pointwise cumulants.

Clearly, one has $\mathcal{M}(\Omega_\infty) \subset \mathcal{M}(\Omega_0)$. Also, for $\xi, \bar{\xi} \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_0)$ defined on the same probability space, we say that ξ and $\bar{\xi}$ jointly admit pointwise cumulants if, for every $N \geq 2$, $1 \leq M \leq N$, and $\mathfrak{t} : [N] \to \mathfrak{L}_-$ the multiset $\{\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(m)}\}_{m=1}^M \sqcup \{\bar{\xi}_{\mathfrak{t}(n)}\}_{n=M+1}^N$ admits pointwise cumulants.

We now define the following family of "norms" on $\mathcal{M}(\Omega_0)$.

Definition 2.14 For $\xi \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_0)$ and $N \geq 2$, we set $\|\xi\|_{N,|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}}$ to be given by

$$\mathrm{Diag}(\xi) \wedge \max_{\substack{2 \leq M \leq N \\ \mathfrak{t}:[M] \to \mathfrak{L}_-}} \sup_{\substack{x \in \mathbf{R}^{dM} \\ x \notin \mathrm{Diag}_M}} \big| \mathbf{E}^c[\{\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(m)}(x_m)\}_{m=1}^M] \big| \Big(\sup_{1 \leq i < j \leq M} |x_i - x_j| \Big)^{|\mathfrak{t}([M])|_{\mathfrak{s}}} \, ,$$

where we use the notation $[M] = \{1, \dots, M\}$ and $|\mathfrak{t}([M])|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is as in Definition 2.1. We have also set

$$\mathrm{Diag}(\xi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{\mathfrak{t}:[2]\to\mathfrak{L}_-} \max_{|k|_{\mathfrak{s}} < -|\mathfrak{t}([2])|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{s}|} |\tilde{F}(\bullet^k)| \,, \tag{2.9}$$

where $\tilde{F}$ is the distribution associated to $\mathbf{E}^c[\{\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(1)}, \xi_{\mathfrak{t}(2)}\}]$ as in (2.8).

Remark 2.15 The point of the definition of $\mathrm{Diag}(\xi)$ is that in general we do not impose that the function $\mathbf{E}^c[\{\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(1)}, \xi_{\mathfrak{t}(2)}\}]$ is locally integrable near the diagonal. In general, there are then several inequivalent ways of extending it to a distribution, and these are precisely parametrised by the values $\tilde{F}(\bullet^k)$.

It turns out that this "norm" also naturally defines a "metric" on the elements of $\mathcal{M}(\Omega_0)$ which defined on the same probability space. (We write "metric" in quotation marks since it does not satisfy the triangle inequality.)

Definition 2.16 For $\xi, \bar{\xi} \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_0)$ defined on the same probability space and jointly admitting pointwise cumulants we set $\|\xi; \bar{\xi}\|_{N,|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}}$ to be given by

$$\mathrm{Diag}(\xi;\bar{\xi}) \wedge \max_{\substack{\hat{M}\le M\le N \\ \mathfrak{t}:[\hat{M}]\to\mathfrak{L}_-}} \sup_{\substack{x\in\mathbf{R}^{dM} \\ x\notin \mathrm{Diag}_M}} \left|\mathbf{E}^c\Big[\{\hat{\xi}_{\mathfrak{t}(i),i}(x_i)\}_{i=1}^M\Big]\right| \Big(\sup_{1\le i<j\le M} |x_i - x_j|\Big)^{|\mathfrak{t}([M])|_{\mathfrak{s}}}$$

where, for any $\hat{M} \le M$, the generalized random fields $\{\hat{\xi}_{\mathfrak{t},i}\}_{i=1}^M$ are given by

$$\hat{\xi}_{\mathfrak{t},i} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \xi_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathbb{1}\{i \le \hat{M}\} - \bar{\xi}_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathbb{1}\{i \ge \hat{M}\} \,,$$

and we have defined

$$\mathrm{Diag}(\xi;\bar{\xi}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{\substack{\mathfrak{t}:[2]\to\mathfrak{L}_- \\ 1\le\hat{M}\le 2}} \max_{\substack{k\in\mathbf{N}^d, \\ |k|_{\mathfrak{s}} < -|\mathfrak{t}([2])|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{s}|}} |\mathbf{E}^c[\{\hat{\xi}_{\mathfrak{t}(1)}, \hat{\xi}_{\mathfrak{t}(2)}\}](\bullet^k)| \,,$$

where we again identify $\mathbf{E}^c[\{\hat{\xi}_{\mathfrak{t}(1)}, \hat{\xi}_{\mathfrak{t}(2)}\}]$ as an element of $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbf{R}^d)$. If ξ and $\bar{\xi}$ do not admit joint pointwise cumulants we set $\|\xi;\bar{\xi}\|_N = \infty$ for every N.

2.4.2 Assumptions on the regularity structure

We start with assumptions on the homogeneity assignment defined on $\mathfrak{L}$.

Assumption 2.17 *For every $\mathfrak{l} \in \mathfrak{L}_-$ one has $|\mathfrak{l}|_{\mathfrak{s}} > -\frac{2|\mathfrak{s}|}{3}$ and for every $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{L}_+$ one has $|\mathfrak{t}|_{\mathfrak{s}} \le |\mathfrak{s}|$.*

Next we state an assumption on semi-decorated trees we will need in order to prove our stochastic bounds.

Definition 2.18 Given a homogeneity assignment $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$, a semi-decorated tree $T^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}}$ is said to be $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$-*super-regular* if for every subtree S of T with $|N(S)| > 1$ we have:

1. $|S^0_{\mathfrak{c}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} > -\frac{|\mathfrak{s}|}{2}$.
2. For any $u \in L(T)$, one has $|S^0_{\mathfrak{c}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |\mathfrak{t}(u)|_{\mathfrak{s}} > -|\mathfrak{s}|$.
3. For any non-empty subset $\tilde{L} \subset L(S)$ one has $|(S,0)^0_{\mathfrak{c}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{t}(\tilde{L})|_{\mathfrak{s}} > 0$.

To state the main result of this article, we make use of translated and rescaled test functions, namely we write

$$\psi^\lambda_z(x_1,\dots,x_d) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda^{-|\mathfrak{s}|}\psi\big(\lambda^{-\mathfrak{s}_1}(x_1 - x_1),\dots,\lambda^{-\mathfrak{s}_d}(x_d - z_d)\big)\ .$$

Remark 2.19 In the statement of the main theorem which immediately follows and subsequent proofs and we will use generalisations $\|\bullet\|_{N,\mathfrak{c}}$ and $\|\bullet;\bullet\|_{N,\mathfrak{c}}$ of Definitions 2.14 and 2.16 as well as a notion of "$(\mathfrak{c},|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}})$-super-regularity" which generalizes Definition 2.18. Here $\mathfrak{c}$ is a parameter which will be called a *cumulant homogeneity* consistent with $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ - this is explained in Appendix A.2. As this notion is a bit technical we prefer to state the main theorem without introducing it. For now, the reader who doesn't which to delve into these details could just keep in mind that there is an acceptable choice of the parameter $\mathfrak{c}$ for which $(\mathfrak{c},|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}})$-super-regularity reduces to the $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ super-regularity of Definition 2.18 and for which the quantities $\|\bullet\|_{N,\mathfrak{c}}$ and $\|\bullet;\bullet\|_{N,\mathfrak{c}}$ reduce to $\|\bullet\|_{N,|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}}$ and $\|\bullet;\bullet\|_{N,|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}}$, respectively. This follows from Remark A.20 in the appendix.

Theorem 2.20 *Fix $d \geq 1$, a scaling $\mathfrak{s}$, finite sets of types $\mathfrak{L}_-$ and $\mathfrak{L}_+$, a homogeneity assignment $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ satisfying Assumption 2.17, and a cumulant homogeneity $\mathfrak{c}$ consistent with $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ Let R be a complete subcritical rule and $\mathscr{T}$ be the corresponding reduced regularity structure.*

Then the lift of random noise-type maps to random smooth admissible models on $\mathscr{T}$ given by $\xi \mapsto Z^\xi_{\text{BPHZ}}$ has the following properties.

For every compact $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathbf{R}^d$, $\xi \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_\infty)$, $p \in \mathbf{N}$, $\lambda \in (0,1]$, $\tau \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} T^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{c}} \in B_\circ$ which is $(\mathfrak{c},|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}})$-super regular with and with $\mathfrak{n}(\varrho_T) = 0$, any $\psi : \mathbf{R}^d \to \mathbf{R}$ is a continuous function supported in $B_{\mathfrak{s}}(0,1)$ which admits, for every $k \in \mathbf{N}^d$ with $|k|_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq \frac{1}{3}|\mathfrak{s}|$, a continuous derivative $D^k\psi$ satisfying $\sup_{x\in\mathbf{R}^d}|D^k\psi(x)| \leq 1$, there exists $C_{p,\tau}$ such that, writing $Z^\xi_{\text{BPHZ}} = (\hat{\Pi}^\xi, \hat{\Gamma}^\xi)$, one has

$$\mathbf{E}\Big(\hat{\Pi}^\xi_z[\tau](\psi^\lambda_z)\Big)^{2p} \leq C_{\tau,p}\Big(\prod_{e\in K(T)}\|K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}\|_{|\mathfrak{t}(e)|_{\mathfrak{s}},m}\Big)^{2p}\|\zeta\|^{2p}_{j,\mathfrak{c}}\lambda^{2p|\tau|_{\mathfrak{s}}} \tag{2.10}$$

where $m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2|\mathfrak{s}|\cdot|N(T)|$ and $j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2p|L(T)|$. Moreover, with the same notation and conventions as above, for any $\bar{\xi} \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_\infty)$ defined on the same probability space one has

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}\Big[\Big(\hat{\Pi}^\xi_z - \hat{\Pi}^{\bar{\xi}}_z\Big)[\tau](\psi^\lambda_z)\Big]^{2p} \\ \leq C_{\tau,p}\Big(\prod_{e\in K(T)}\|K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}\|_{|\mathfrak{t}(e)|_{\mathfrak{s}},m}\Big)^{2p}(\|\xi\|_{j,\mathfrak{c}} \vee \|\bar{\xi}\|_{j,\mathfrak{c}})\|\xi;\bar{\xi}\|^{2p}_{j,\mathfrak{c}}\lambda^{2p|\tau|_{\mathfrak{s}}}\ .\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Definition 2.21 Given homogeneity assignments $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $[\![\cdot]\!]_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and a rule R which is complete and subcritical with respect to $[\![\cdot]\!]_{\mathfrak{s}}$, we say $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is R-consistent with $[\![\cdot]\!]_{\mathfrak{s}}$ if all of the following conditions hold:

- $[\![\cdot]\!]_{\mathfrak{s}}$ satisfies Assumptions 2.17.
- R is also a complete and subcritical rule with respect to $[\![\cdot]\!]_{\mathfrak{s}}$.
- The triple $(B_\circ, B_-, B_+)$ of collections of semi-decorated trees generated by the rule R under either $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $[\![\cdot]\!]_{\mathfrak{s}}$ coincide.
- For any semi-decorated tree $T_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathfrak{n}} \in B_\pm$, one has

$$\lfloor |T_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathfrak{n}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} \rfloor = \lfloor [\![T_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathfrak{n}}]\!]_{\mathfrak{s}} \rfloor \,.$$

Combining Theorem 2.20 with the proof of [Hai14, Thm 10.7] yields the following theorem.

Theorem 2.22 *Fix $d \geq 1$, a scaling $\mathfrak{s}$, finite sets of types $\mathfrak{L}_-$ and $\mathfrak{L}_+$, a homogeneity assignment $[\![\cdot]\!]_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and a rule R which is complete and subcritical with respect to $[\![\cdot]\!]_{\mathfrak{s}}$. Denote by $\mathscr{T} = (A, \mathcal{T}, G)$ be the corresponding reduced regularity structure.*

Fix, $\kappa > 0$, a second homogeneity assignment $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$, and a cumulant homogeneity $\mathfrak{c}$ consistent with $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ with the following properties:

- *$|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is R-consistent with $[\![\cdot]\!]_{\mathfrak{s}}$.*
- *For any $\alpha \in A$ with $\alpha < 0$, every semi-decorated tree $T_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathfrak{n}} \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$ is $(\mathfrak{c}, |\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}})$-super regular and furthermore one has*

$$|T_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathfrak{n}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} \geq [\![T_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathfrak{n}}]\!]_{\mathfrak{s}} + \kappa.$$

Then the lift of random noise-type maps to random smooth admissible models on $\mathscr{T}$ given by $\xi \mapsto Z^{\xi}_{\text{BPHZ}}$ has the following property.

For every compact set $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathbf{R}^d$ and $p \in \mathbf{N}$ there exists C such that for any $\xi, \bar{\xi} \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_\infty)$ one has

$$\mathbf{E}\|\!| Z^{\xi}_{\text{BPHZ}}; Z^{\bar{\xi}}_{\text{BPHZ}} |\!\|^{2p}_{\alpha,\mathfrak{K}} \leq C(\|\xi\|_{j,\mathfrak{c}} \vee \|\bar{\xi}\|_{j,\mathfrak{c}})(\|\xi;\bar{\xi}\|_{j,\mathfrak{c}})$$

where $j = 2p \cdot \max\{|L(T)| : T_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathfrak{n}} \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha \text{ for } \alpha \in A,\ \alpha < 0\}$.

Remark 2.23 Henceforth all of our estimates are claimed to be uniform in $\lambda \in (0, 1]$, even if this is not explicitly stated.

For the rest of the paper we fix a cumulant homogeneity $\mathfrak{c}$ consistent with our fixed homogeneity assignment $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and a $(\mathfrak{c}, |\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}})$-super regular semi-decorated tree $\overline{T}^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\overline{\mathfrak{c}}} \in B_\circ$ for which we will prove Theorem 2.20.

3 Renormalization of combinatorial trees and random fields

3.1 Colorings, a new decoration, more homogeneities, and identified forests

3.1.1 Colorings

Definition 3.1 A colored forest is a pair $(F, \hat{F})$ where F is a typed rooted forest and the "coloring" $\hat{F}$ is a pair $(\hat{F}_1, \hat{F}_2)$ of disjoint subforests of F with the property

that $\varrho(\hat{F}_2) \subset \varrho(F)$.

Note that $\hat{F}$ induces a map[9] $\hat{F} : N_F \sqcup E_F \to \{0,1,2\}$ by setting $\hat{F}(u) = i$ if $u \in N_{\hat{F}_i} \sqcup E_{\hat{F}_i}$ and $\hat{F}(u) = 0$ otherwise. Clearly, one can recover the tuple $\hat{F}$ from the map $\hat{F}(\cdot)$.

There is a useful alternate notation for specifying colorings of a forest. Given F and two disjoint subforests A and B of F with $\varrho(B) \subset \varrho(F)$ we write $[A]_1 \sqcup [B]_2$ for the coloring $\hat{F} = (A, B)$. If one of the two forests is empty we may drop it, i.e. we may write $(F, [A]_1)$ instead of $(F, [A]_1 \sqcup [\mathbf{1}]_2)$. Additionally, for $i \in \{0,1,2\}$ we write (F, i) for the colored forest with the constant coloring $\hat{F}(\cdot) = i$.

3.1.2 Decorated colored forests

A decorated colored forest consists of a colored forest $(F, \hat{F})$ and three maps: $\mathfrak{n} : N(F) \to \mathbf{N}^d$, $\mathfrak{o} : N(\hat{F}_1) \to \mathbf{Z}^d \oplus \mathbf{Z}(\mathfrak{L})$, and $\mathfrak{e} : E_F \to \mathbf{N}^d$, where $\mathbf{Z}(\mathfrak{L})$ denotes the free $\mathbf{Z}$-module generated by $\mathfrak{L}$. Given a colored forest $(F, \hat{F})$ and decorations $\mathfrak{n}$, $\mathfrak{o}$, and $\mathfrak{e}$ on F we denote the corresponding decorated colored forest by $(F, \hat{F})_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}$.

For the trivial tree we just write $(\bullet, i)^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}$ and also observe that the empty forest $\mathbf{1}$ is automatically a decorated colored forest. When working with a forest $(F, \hat{F})$ where $\hat{F}_1 = \mathbf{1}$ we abuse notation and write $\mathfrak{o} = 0$ instead of writing $\mathfrak{o} = \emptyset$. Moreover, if the $\mathfrak{o}$-label vanishes or is given by $\emptyset$ we sometimes drop it from the notation.

Observe that given a decorated colored forest $(F, \hat{F})_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}$ and a subforest A of F there is, by taking restrictions, a corresponding decorated colored forest $(A, \hat{F})_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}$. Here we abuse notation by not making this restriction on our decorations or colorings explicit in our notation.

Clearly any semi-decorated tree $T_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n}}$ naturally corresponds to a decorated colored tree $(T, 0)_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n}}$. Finally, we also remark that the forest product extends naturally to a product on decorated colored forests.

3.1.3 More homogeneities

With the introduction of coloring and $|\cdot|_s$ we define define two homogeneities $|\cdot|_+$ and $|\cdot|_-$ on decorated colored forests as follows: given $\tau = (F, \hat{F})_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}$, we set

$$|\tau|_- \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\substack{e \in E_F \\ \hat{F}(e)=0}} (|\mathfrak{t}(e)|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{e}(e)|_{\mathfrak{s}}) + \sum_{u \in N(F)} |\mathfrak{n}(u)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \,,$$

$$|\tau|_+ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\substack{e \in E_F \\ \hat{F}(e)\neq 2}} (|\mathfrak{t}(e)|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{e}(e)|_{\mathfrak{s}}) + \sum_{\substack{u \in N(F) \\ \hat{F}(u)\neq 2}} (|\mathfrak{n}(u)|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |\mathfrak{o}(u)|_{\mathfrak{s}}) \,.$$

[9] Here $\hat{F}$ is an overloaded notation but whether it is being treated as a subforest or as a map should always be clear from context.

3.1.4 Identified forests

An *identified forest* (or i-forest) is a pair $\sigma = (\sigma, \iota_\sigma)$ where σ is a colored forest and ι_σ is a forest morphism from σ into $\overline{T}$ which restricts to a tree monomorphism on *each connected component* of σ. Note that ι_σ is *not* required to be globally injective and in most cases it will not be. Two i-forests $\sigma_{\mathbf{1}}, \sigma_{\mathbf{2}}$ are isomorphic if there exists a forest isomorphism $\iota\colon \sigma_1 \to \sigma_2$ such that $\iota_{\sigma_{\mathbf{2}}} \circ \iota = \iota_{\sigma_{\mathbf{1}}}$.

Sometimes when talking about an i-forest σ we may write

$$\sigma = (F^{(1)}, \widehat{F^{(1)}}) \cdots (F^{(k)}, \widehat{F^{(k)}}). \tag{3.1}$$

In this case it should be understood that for $1 \leq j \leq k$ the $F^{(j)}$ are explicit subforests of $\overline{T}$ and there is no need to mention ι_σ. Note that there is some subtlety here since the $F^{(j)}$ may not be *disjoint* subforests of $\overline{T}$.

We make decorations explicit in our notation, so writing σ indicates the constituent σ is undecorated while in the decorated case we write $\sigma^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}}$. Note that the decorations of an i-forest are not necessarily inherited from $\overline{T}^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\overline{\mathfrak{e}}}$.

Recall that when we say S is a subtree of $\overline{T}$ we are being more explicit with how S is identified as a sub-object of $\overline{T}$, that is $N_S \subset N_{\overline{T}}$, $N(S) \subset N(\overline{T})$, and $E_S \subset E_{\overline{T}}$ as concrete sets with the type map on E_S being the restriction of the one on $E_{\overline{T}}$. For an i-tree σ we usually write $\sigma = (S, 0)$ where S is a subtree of $\overline{T}$.

The set of all decorated i-forests is denoted by $\underline{\mathfrak{F}_2}$. The subset of $\underline{\mathfrak{F}_2}$ of decorated i-trees is denoted by $\underline{\mathfrak{T}_2}$. For $i \in \{0, 1\}$ we define $\underline{\mathfrak{T}_i}$ as the collection of all decorated i-trees $(T, \hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \mathfrak{T}_2$ with $\hat{T}(\cdot) \leq i$ and define $\underline{\mathfrak{F}_i}$ analogously. Given any collection of decorated i-forests $\mathfrak{G}$ we denote by $\mathring{\mathfrak{G}}$ the corresponding set of undecorated objects.

We denote by $\langle \underline{\mathfrak{F}_2} \rangle$ the unital algebra obtained by endowing free vector space generated by $\underline{\mathfrak{F}_2}$ with the (linear extension of the) forest product. For any subset $A \subset \underline{\mathfrak{F}_2}$ we denote by $\langle A \rangle_{\text{for}}$ and $\langle A \rangle$ the subalgebra of $\langle \underline{\mathfrak{F}_2} \rangle$ generated by A and the vector subspace of $\langle \underline{\mathfrak{F}_2} \rangle$ generated by A, respectively.

3.2 Co-actions and twisted antipodes

Our algebraic description of positive and negative renormalizations both involve two steps. In the first step one uses a "co-action" extracts object(s) which will be later assigned a counterterm and in the second step one builds the counter-term by using a "twisted antipode" to perform recursive renormalization procedure *within* the extracted object(s).

Each coaction produces a linear combination of tensor products - in each product one factor consists of the extracted object(s) to be assigned counter-terms while the other factor consists of the part of $\overline{T}$ which is left over. On the other hand each twisted antipode will generate a forest product.

3.2.1 Negative renormalization

First, we define a set of decorated i-trees which, due to their power-counting, should be assigned counterterms for negative renormalization. We set

$$\mathfrak{X}_- \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{(T,0)^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \underline{\mathfrak{T}_0} : \ \mathfrak{n}(\varrho_T) = 0 \text{ and } |(T,0)^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}}|_- < 0\right\} ,$$

and we define $\mathfrak{p}_- : \langle \underline{\mathfrak{T}_0} \rangle_{\text{for}} \to \langle \mathfrak{X}_- \rangle_{\text{for}}$ to be the algebra homorphism given by projection onto $\langle \mathfrak{X}_- \rangle_{\text{for}}$. The co-action describing the negative renormalization is a linear map

$$\hat{\Delta}_- : \langle \underline{\mathfrak{T}_0} \rangle \to \langle \mathfrak{X}_- \rangle_{\text{for}} \otimes \langle \underline{\mathfrak{T}_1} \rangle \ .$$

We now specify, for each given i-tree, what sorts of subforests we will try to extract when applying $\hat{\Delta}_-$.

Definition 3.2 For $(F,0) \in \mathring{\mathfrak{F}}_0$ we define $\mathfrak{A}_1(F,0)$ to be the collection of all subforests G of F with the property that Conn(G) contains no trivial trees.

Note that one always has $\mathbf{1} \in \mathfrak{A}_1(F,0)$. Now, for any $(T,0)^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \underline{\mathfrak{T}_0}$, we set

$$\hat{\Delta}_-(T,0)^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{G \in \mathfrak{A}_1(T,0)} \sum_{\mathfrak{n}_G, \mathfrak{e}_G} \mathfrak{p}_- \left[(G,0)^{\mathfrak{n}_G + \chi^{\mathfrak{e}_G}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \right] \otimes (T, [G]_1)^{\mathfrak{n}-\mathfrak{n}_G, \mathfrak{n}_G + \chi^{\mathfrak{e}_G}}_{\mathfrak{e}_G + \mathfrak{e}} \ . \quad (3.2)$$

Here in the second sum above we are summing over (i) all $\mathfrak{n}_G : N(T) \to \mathbf{N}^d$ supported on $N(G)$ and (ii) all $\mathfrak{e}_G : E_T \to \mathbf{N}^d$ supported on

$$\partial(G,T) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(e_{\text{p}}, e_{\text{c}}) \in E_T \setminus E_G : \ e_{\text{p}} \in N_T\} \ .$$

Also, for forest T and any decoration $\tilde{\mathfrak{e}} : E_T \to \mathbf{N}^d$ we define $\chi^{\tilde{\mathfrak{e}}} : N(T) \to \mathbf{N}^d$ as $\chi^{\tilde{\mathfrak{e}}}(u) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{e \,:\, e_{\text{p}} = u} \tilde{\mathfrak{e}}(e)$.

Remark 3.3 The appearance of formulas like (3.2) will be quite common - we adopt these conventions on the meaning of $\sum_{\mathfrak{n}_G, \mathfrak{e}_G}$ throughout this paper. Note that they make sense even if T is replaced by a forest and G is a subforest of F.

Recursive negative renormalization is described by an algebra homomorphism

$$\hat{\mathscr{A}}_- : \langle \mathfrak{X}_- \rangle_{\text{for}} \to \langle \underline{\mathfrak{T}_1} \rangle_{\text{for}} \ .$$

One can imagine $\hat{\mathscr{A}}_-$ as given by iteration of a "reduced" analogue of $\hat{\Delta}_-$. By reduced, we mean it is more constrained in what objects it extracts.

Definition 3.4 For $(F,0) \in \mathring{\mathfrak{F}}_0$ we define $\overline{\mathfrak{A}}_1(F,0)$ to be the collection of all $G \in \overline{\mathfrak{A}}_1(F,0)$ with the property that for every $T \in$ Conn(F) one has $T \notin$ Conn(G).

We first define the map $\hat{\mathscr{A}}_-$ for any $(F,0)^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \mathfrak{F}_0$ which can be wrriten as a forest product of elements of $\mathfrak{X}_-$.

This definition will be inductive in $|E_F|$ wiht the base case given by setting $\hat{\mathscr{A}}_- \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$. The induction is given by setting

$$\hat{\mathscr{A}}_-(F,0)^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (-1)^{|\text{Conn}(F)|} \sum_{G \in \overline{\mathfrak{A}}_1(F,0)} \sum_{\mathfrak{n}_G, \mathfrak{e}_G} \left[\hat{\mathscr{A}}_- \mathfrak{p}_-(G,0)^{\mathfrak{n}_G + \chi^{\mathfrak{e}_G}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \right] \cdot (F, [G]_1)^{\mathfrak{n}-\mathfrak{n}_G}_{\mathfrak{e}_G + \mathfrak{e}} \ .$$

3.2.2 Positive renormalization

In order to define $\mathfrak{X}_+$ we first need some new notions. Given a subtree T of $\overline{T}$ and an edge $e \in E_T$ we define $T_{\geq}(e)$ to be the subtree of T formed by all edges $e' \in E_T$ with $e \geq e'$, the corresponding node set being given by the collection of all $u \in N_T$ with $u \geq e_{\mathfrak{c}}$.

Since it will be useful later we also define $T_{\not\geq}(e)$ to be the subtree of T determined by all edges $e' \in E_{\overline{T}}$ with $e' \not\geq e$, the corresponding node set is given by the collection of all $u \in N_{\overline{T}}$ with $u \not> e_{\mathfrak{p}}$.

We draw a picture to make these definitions clear. On the leftmost picture we draw some subtree T of $\overline{T}$ and specify an edge $e \in E_T$ by drawing a small bisector in the middle of it. In the middle picture we have shaded in the subtree $T_{\geq}(e)$ while on the rightmost picture we have shaded in the subtree $T_{\not\geq}(e)$.



Definition 3.5 Given a subtree S of $\overline{T}$ and a subtree S' of S we define $\mathfrak{T}(S, S')$ to be the collection of subtrees of S defined as follows

$$\mathfrak{T}(S, S') \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \big\{ S_{\geq}(e) : \; e \in K(S),\; e_{\mathfrak{p}} \in N_{S'},\; e_{\mathfrak{c}} \notin N_{S'} \big\} \; .$$

We also define $\widehat{\underline{\mathfrak{T}}_2} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(T, \hat{T})_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}} \in \mathfrak{T}_2 : \; \hat{T}_2 \neq \mathbf{1}\}$. Finally we set

$$\mathfrak{X}_+ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big\{ (T, \hat{T})_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}} \in \widehat{\underline{\mathfrak{T}}_2} : \; \forall S \in \mathfrak{T}(T, \hat{T}_2),\; |\tilde{P}(S, \hat{T})_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}|_+ > 0 \Big\} \; ,$$

where the map $\tilde{P} : \underline{\mathfrak{F}_2} \to \underline{\mathfrak{F}_2}$ acts on decorated colored forests by setting their root $\mathfrak{n}$ label to vanish, that is

$$\tilde{P}(F, \hat{F})_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (F, \hat{F})_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{n}},\mathfrak{o}} \; , \qquad \tilde{\mathfrak{n}}(u) = \mathfrak{n}(u) \mathbb{1}\{u \notin \varrho(F)\} \; .$$

We define $\mathfrak{p}_+ : \langle \widehat{\underline{\mathfrak{T}}_2} \rangle_{\text{for}} \to \langle \mathfrak{X}_+ \rangle_{\text{for}}$ to be the algebra homomorphism given by projection onto $\langle \mathfrak{X}_+ \rangle_{\text{for}}$. The co-action for positive renormalization is a linear map

$$\hat{\Delta}_+ : \; \langle \underline{\mathfrak{T}_1} \rangle \to \langle \underline{\mathfrak{T}_1} \rangle \otimes \langle \mathfrak{X}_+ \rangle \; .$$

Definition 3.6 Given $(T,\hat{T}) \in \mathring{\underline{\hat{\mathfrak{T}}}}_2$ we define $\mathfrak{A}_2(T,\hat{T})$ to be the collection of all subtrees S of T with the following properties

- $\varrho_S = \varrho_T$.
- $\hat{T}_2$ is a subtree of S and for every $T' \in \mathrm{Conn}(\hat{T}_1)$ one has that T' is either a subtree of S or disjoint with S.

We then define, for any $(T,\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \underline{\mathfrak{T}_1}$

$$\hat{\Delta}_+(T,\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\substack{S\in\mathfrak{A}_2(T,\hat{T})\\ \mathfrak{n}_S,\mathfrak{e}_S}} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{e}_S!}\binom{\mathfrak{n}}{\mathfrak{n}_S}(S,\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n}_S+\chi\mathfrak{e}_S}_{\mathfrak{e}} \otimes \mathfrak{p}_+\Big(T,[\hat{T}_1\setminus S]_1 \sqcup [S]_2\Big)^{\mathfrak{n}-\mathfrak{n}_S,\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}_S+\mathfrak{e}} . \tag{3.3}$$

The recursive positive renormalization procedure is similarly described by a linear map

$$\hat{\mathscr{A}}_+ : \langle \mathfrak{X}_+\rangle \to \langle \widehat{\underline{\mathfrak{T}}_2}\rangle_{\text{for}} .$$

It suffices to define the map $\hat{\mathscr{A}}_+$ for any $(T,\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \mathfrak{X}_+$ and then extend linearly. This definition on $\mathfrak{X}_+$ will be inductive with respect to $|E_T \setminus E_{\hat{T}_2}|$. The base case, when $|E_T \setminus E_{\hat{T}_2}| = 0$, is given by setting

$$\hat{\mathscr{A}}_+(T,2)^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (-1)^{\sum_{u\in N(T)}|\mathfrak{n}(u)|}(T,2)^{\mathfrak{n},0}_{\mathfrak{e}}.$$

Before stating the inductive definition we need some more notation.

Definition 3.7 Given $(T,\hat{T}) \in \mathring{\widehat{\mathfrak{T}}}_2$ we define $\overline{\mathfrak{A}}_2(T,\hat{T})$ to be the collection of all $S \in \mathfrak{A}_2(T,\hat{T})$ such that, for every $T' \in \mathfrak{T}(T,\hat{T}_2)$, one has $E_{T'} \cap E_S \neq \emptyset$.

Definition 3.8 Given $(T,\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \underline{\widehat{\mathfrak{T}}_2}$ we define $\mathfrak{E}[(T,\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}}]$ to be the set of all edge decorations $\mathfrak{e}_T$ on $K(\overline{T})$ supported on $\partial(\hat{T}_2,T)$ such that $(T,\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{e}_T} \in \mathfrak{X}_+$.

We then set, for any $(T,\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \mathfrak{X}_+$ with $\hat{T} \not\equiv 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathscr{A}}_+(T,\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (-1)^{|\mathfrak{T}(T,\hat{T}_2)|} \sum_{S\in\overline{\mathfrak{A}}_2(T,\hat{T})} \sum_{\mathfrak{n}_S,\mathfrak{e}_S,\mathfrak{f}} \binom{\mathfrak{n}-\hat{\mathfrak{n}}}{\mathfrak{n}_S} \frac{(-1)^{\sum_{u\in N(T)}(|\hat{\mathfrak{n}}(u)|+|\chi\mathfrak{f}(u)|)}}{(\mathfrak{f}+\mathfrak{e}_S)!}\\ \cdot (S,\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n}_S+\hat{\mathfrak{n}}+\chi(\mathfrak{e}_S+\mathfrak{f}),0}_{\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{f}} \cdot \hat{\mathscr{A}}_+\mathfrak{p}_+\Big(T,[\hat{T}_1\setminus S]_1\sqcup[S]_2\Big)^{\mathfrak{n}-\mathfrak{n}_S-\hat{\mathfrak{n}},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}_S+\mathfrak{e}},\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\mathfrak{n}}(u) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{n}(u)\mathbb{1}\{u \in N(\hat{T}_2)\}$ and the sum over $\mathfrak{f}$ is a sum over all edge decorations $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathfrak{E}[(T,\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}}]$.

Our objective in this section is to describe two ways to map the decorated i-forests of the previous section to space-time functions and random fields.

3.3 From combinatorial trees to space-time functions

In this subsection we describe how, for each noise type map $\zeta \in \Omega_\infty$, to map i-forests to functions of the space-time variables $(x_v)_{v\in N^*}$ where we set $N^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} N(\overline{T}) \sqcup \{\circledast\}$. Here $\circledast$ is a new node element and the corresponding $x_\circledast$ is the variable that encodes the base-point (the z of Π_z). For any finite set A we write $\mathscr{C}_A$ for the algebra of smooth functions $\mathscr{C}^\infty((\mathbf{R}^d)^A)$ and we also use the shorthand $\mathscr{C}_* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathscr{C}_{N^*}$.

Throughout this article, given some finite set A, some $x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^A$, and some $B \subset A$, we write x_B for the element of $(\mathbf{R}^d)^B$ with $(x_B)_i = x_i$ for $i \in B$. Similarly, we will always use the shorthands $\int dy_B$ or $\int_B dy$ instead of writing $\int_{(\mathbf{R}^d)^B} dy$. Finally, for $B \subset A$, we will always view $\mathscr{C}_B$ as a subspace of $\mathscr{C}_A$ via the canonical injection ι given by $(\iota f)(x) = f(x_B)$. For two disjoint sets A and $\bar{A}$ and elements $x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^A$ and $\bar{x} \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\bar{A}}$, we also write $x \sqcup \bar{x}$ for the element $y \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{A\sqcup\bar{A}}$ given by $y_i = x_i$ for $i \in A$ and $y_i = \bar{x}_i$ for $i \in \bar{A}$. Sometimes, we will make the abuse of notation of writing x_u instead of $x_{\{u\}}$ in expressions like "$x_u \sqcup y_A$".

First, for any i-tree $(T, \hat{T})$ we make the following definitions. We define set $K(T,\hat{T}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K(T) \cap \hat{T}^{-1}(0)$ and $L(T,\hat{T}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L(T) \cap \hat{T}^{-1}(0)$. We set

$$N(T,\hat{T}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} N(T) \cap (\hat{T}^{-1}(0) \sqcup \varrho(\hat{T}_1)).$$

We also define an associated map $\mathrm{gv} : N(T) \to N(T,\hat{T}) \sqcup \{\circledast\}$ by setting, for each $u \in N(T)$,

$$\mathrm{gv}(u) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} u & \text{if } u \in N(T,\hat{T}), \\ \varrho_S & \text{if } u \in N(S) \text{ for } S \in \mathrm{Conn}(\hat{T}_1), \\ \circledast & \text{if } u \in N(\hat{T}_2). \end{cases}$$

For any $\xi \in \Omega_\infty$ and decorated i-tree $(T,\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \mathfrak{T}_2$ we define $\mathring{\Upsilon}^\xi[(T,\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}}] \in \mathscr{C}_*$ by

$$\mathring{\Upsilon}^\xi[(T,\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}}](x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big(\prod_{u\in N(T)} (x_{\mathrm{gv}(u)})^{\mathfrak{n}(u)}\Big)\Big(\prod_{e\in K(T,\hat{T})} D^{\mathfrak{e}(e)} K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}(x_{\mathrm{gv}(e_\mathrm{p})} - x_{\mathrm{gv}(e_\mathrm{c})})\Big) \cdot \Big(\prod_{v\in L(T,\hat{T})} \xi_{\mathfrak{t}(v)}(x_v)\Big) .$$

We then define an algebra homomorphism $\Upsilon^\xi : \langle \underline{\mathfrak{F}_2} \rangle \to \mathscr{C}_*$ by setting, for $(T,\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \mathfrak{T}_2$,

$$\Upsilon^\xi[(T,\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}}](x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\tilde{N}(T,\hat{T})} \mathrm{d}y \; \mathring{\Upsilon}^\xi[(T,\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}}](y \sqcup x_{\varrho_T} \sqcup x_\circledast) ,$$

and then extending multipliciatively and linearly to all of Υ^ξ (in particular, $\Upsilon^\xi[\mathbf{1}] = 1$). We also make the important observation that $\Upsilon^\xi[(T,\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}}](x)$ depends only on *either* x_{ϱ_T} *or* $x_\circledast$ the former case holds when $\hat{T}_2 = \mathbf{1}$ and the later when $\hat{T}_2 \neq \mathbf{1}$.

3.4 The BPHZ renormalized tree

We now make our setting stochastic by fixing for what follows an arbitrary random noise type map $\xi \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_\infty)$.

We define an algebra homomorphism $\bar{\Upsilon}^\xi : \langle \mathfrak{F}_1 \rangle_{\text{for}} \to \mathbf{R}$ by setting, for any $\sigma_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}} \in \underline{\mathfrak{T}_1}$,

$$\bar{\Upsilon}^\xi[\sigma_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{E}(\Upsilon^\xi \sigma_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}})(0) \,, \tag{3.4}$$

and extending this definition multiplicatively and linearly.

Remark 3.9 It is important to note here that $\bar{\Upsilon}^\xi$ is deterministic and depends solely on the *law* of the random variable ξ, not on any random sample drawn from it.

Finally, we define, for each realization $\xi(\omega) \in \Omega_\infty$ of ξ, the smooth function $\hat{\Upsilon}^\xi[\overline{T}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}] \in \mathscr{C}_*$, again depending only on $x_{\varrho_{\overline{T}}}$ and $x_\otimes$, by setting

$$\hat{\Upsilon}^{\xi(\omega)}[\overline{T}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big(\bar{\Upsilon}^\xi[\hat{\mathscr{A}}_- \cdot] \otimes \Upsilon^{\xi(\omega)}[\cdot] \otimes \Upsilon^{\xi(\omega)}[\hat{\mathscr{A}}_+ \cdot]\Big)(\mathrm{Id} \otimes \hat{\Delta}_+)\hat{\Delta}_-(\overline{T}, 0)_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}},0} \,. \tag{3.5}$$

Above we are committing an abuse of notation, the RHS is technically a sum of triple tensor products each consisting of a scalar and two elements of $\mathscr{C}_*$, however by simply multiplying them together we view the whole sum as an element of $\mathscr{C}_*$.

We emphasize again that in this expression $\bar{\Upsilon}^\xi$ is *deterministic* and depends on the law of the random variable ξ, while $\Upsilon^{\xi(\omega)}$ is *random* and depends on the specific sample $\xi(\omega)$. Later on, we will however typically suppress the chance element ω in our notations and we will simply write $\hat{\Upsilon}^\xi[\overline{T}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}](x)$ for the above expression. We will also view this as a family of random distributions in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbf{R}^d)$, using the shorthand, for each $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}^d)$,

$$\hat{\Upsilon}_z^\xi[\overline{T}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}](\varphi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\{\varrho_*,\otimes\}} dx \hat{\Upsilon}^\xi[\overline{T}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}](x)\, \varphi(x_{\varrho_*}) \delta(x_\otimes - z) \,,$$

where here, and in what follows,we simply wrote ϱ_* instead of $\varrho_{\overline{T}}$ for the root of $\overline{T}$. We refer to the above random distribution as the BPHZ renormalized tree corresponding to $\overline{T}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}$ with basepoint z.

4 A forest and cut expansion for the BPHZ renormalized tree

The goal of this section is to rewrite the opaque formula for $\hat{\Upsilon}^{\xi(\omega)}[\overline{T}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}]$ given in the previous section in a more explicit form amenable to direct analysis.

4.1 A forest formula for negative renormalizations

For most of this subsection we work with a set of subtrees of $\overline{T}$. We see this set as carrying the inclusion partial order (for which throughout this article we use the convention $\subset \longleftrightarrow \leq$). In general, for any poset A and subset $\mathcal{A} \subset A$ we write $\mathrm{Max}(\mathcal{A})$ or $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ for the set of maximal elements of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathrm{Min}(\mathcal{A})$ or $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ for the set of

minimal elements of $\mathcal{A}$. As an exception to this notation, $\overline{T}$ always refers to our fixed tree.

We write Div for the set of all subtrees S of $\overline{T}$ with $\omega(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -|(S^0_{\mathfrak{e}}, 0)|_{\mathfrak{s}} > 0$. Note that $S \in \text{Div}$ forces S to be non-trivial.

Remark 4.1 Note that as a consequence of Definition 2.18, if one has $S \in \text{Div}$ and $e \in \mathbb{L}(\overline{T})$ with $e_{\text{p}} \in N(S)$ then it must be the case that $e \in \mathbb{L}(S)$.

Definition 4.2 We say that $\mathcal{F}$ is a forest of subtrees if it is a collection of subtrees of $\overline{T}$ with the property that for any pair $S, S' \in \mathcal{F}$ one has either $N_S \subset N_{S'}$, or $N_{S'} \subset N_S$, or $N_S \cap N_{S'} = \emptyset$.

As an example, suppose that $\overline{T}$ is given by



with the root being at the bottom. Indicating subtrees of a tree by shading them, we consider the set $\{S_1, \dots, S_6\}$ of subtrees of $\overline{T}$ given by



(4.1)

Note here that while S_3 and S_4 are isomorphic as labelled trees, they represent different subtrees of $\overline{T}$ and are therefore not isomorphic as i-trees. The list of all subsets of $\{S_1, \dots, S_6\}$ which are forests of subtrees is given by:

$$\emptyset,\ \{S_1\}, \{S_2\}, \{S_3\}, \{S_4\}, \{S_5\}, \{S_6\},$$
$$\{S_3, S_6\}, \{S_2, S_3\},\ \{S_1, S_2\},\ \{S_1, S_3\},\ \{S_1, S_4\},\ \{S_2, S_5\},$$
$$\{S_3, S_5\},\ \{S_4, S_5\},\ \{S_3, S_6\},\ \{S_1, S_2, S_3\},\ \text{and } \{S_2, S_3, S_5\}\ .$$

Remark 4.3 We will use two notions of forest in what follows, one is that of an i-forest and the other is the notion of a forest of subtrees. Clearly any collection $\mathcal{A}$ of subtrees of $\overline{T}$ canonically determines an i-forest where, instead of considering $\mathcal{A}$ as a set with trees as elements, we see it as the i-forest obtained by the disjoint union of these trees.

In the above example $\{S_2, S_3, S_4\}$ can be viewed as an i-forest (and in this case we would write it as $S_2 \cdot S_3 \cdot S_4$), but it is not a forest of subtrees since S_4 is not related to S_2 (or S_3 for that matter) by inclusion. This illustrates that, with this identification, being a forest of subtrees is a strictly stronger property than being an i-forest.

We often use a calligraphic font to indicate forests of subtrees versus standard Roman letters for i-forests. Finally, we observe that in the special case when $\mathcal{F}$ is a forest of subtrees of $\overline{T}$ of depth 1 or 0, the node set N_F of the canonical i-forest F associated to it can be identified as a subset of $N_{\overline{T}}$.

Definition 4.4 We say that a subtree S is *compatible* with a forest of subtrees $\mathcal{F}$ if $\{S\} \cup \mathcal{F}$ is again a forest of subtrees (note that if $S \in \mathcal{F}$, then this is automatically the case).

We write $\mathbb{F}$ for the collection of all forests of subtrees $\mathcal{F}$ such that each tree in $\mathcal{F}$ belongs to Div. Given a forest of subtrees $\mathcal{F}$ and a subtree S compatible with $\mathcal{F}$ we define the forest of subtrees which are the (immediate) children of S in $\mathcal{F}$ as

$$C_{\mathcal{F}}(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Max}\{T \in \mathcal{F} : \ T < S\} \ .$$

and the branch of S in $\mathcal{F}$ by $\mathcal{F}_S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{T \in \mathcal{F} : \ T \leq S\}$.

For non-empty $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}$ and $k \in \mathbf{N}$ we define subsets $D_k(\mathcal{F})$ as follows. We set $D_0(\mathcal{F}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \emptyset$, $D_1(\mathcal{F}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \overline{\mathcal{F}}$, and for $k \geq 1$ we set

$$D_{k+1}(\mathcal{F}) = \bigsqcup_{S \in D_k(\mathcal{F})} C_{\mathcal{F}}(S).$$

We define the depth of $\mathcal{F}$, denoted by depth($\mathcal{F}$), to be given by

$$\text{depth}(\mathcal{F}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf\Big\{k \in \mathbf{N} : \ \bigcup_{j=0}^{k} D_j(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{F}\Big\} = \inf\{k \geq 0 : \ D_{k+1}(\mathcal{F}) = \emptyset\} \ .$$

Recalling our previous pictorial example of forests, if we set $\mathcal{F} = \{S_1, S_2, S_3\}$ we have $D_1(\mathcal{F}) = \{S_1\}$, $D_2(\mathcal{F}) = \{S_2\}$, and $D_3(\mathcal{F}) = \{S_3\}$. On the other hand, if we set $\mathcal{F} = \{S_2, S_3, S_5\}$ then $D_1(\mathcal{F}) = \{S_2, S_5\}$ and $D_2(\mathcal{F}) = \{S_3\}$.

We write $\mathbb{F}^{\leq 1}$ for the collection of elements of $\mathbb{F}$ of depth 1 or 0. We also define, for any $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{F}[\mathcal{F}] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F} : \ \overline{\mathcal{G}} = \mathcal{F}\} \ , \\ \mathbb{F}_<[\mathcal{F}] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \big\{\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq 1} : \ \forall S \in \mathcal{G}, \ \exists T \in \mathcal{F} \text{ with } S < T\big\} \ , \text{ and} \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

$$\mathbb{F}_{\leq}[\mathcal{F}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \big\{\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq 1} : \forall S \in \mathcal{G},\ \exists T \in \mathcal{F} \text{ with } S \leq T\big\} .$$

Note that $\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{F}]$ is empty unless $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq 1}$.

Finally, in some of our statements and proofs it is useful to sum over the decorations of an i-forest while keeping the specific i-forest fixed. We do this by introducing the following family of projection maps.

Definition 4.5 for any *undecorated* i-forest $\sigma \in \mathring{\underline{\mathfrak{F}}}_2$ we write $\mathbf{P}_\sigma$ for the projection onto the subspace of $\langle \underline{\mathfrak{F}}_2 \rangle$ spanned by all decorated i-forests of the form $\sigma_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}$.

We now describe the class of i-forests produced by the action of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_-$.

Definition 4.6 To each $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}$ we associate an i-forest $\sigma_{\mathcal{F}} \in \mathring{\underline{\mathfrak{F}}}_2$ as follows. If $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$ then we set $\sigma_{\mathcal{F}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{1}$. For $\mathcal{F}$ of depth $j > 0$ we set

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{F}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (F^{(j)}, \widehat{F^{(j)}}) \cdots (F^{(1)}, \widehat{F^{(1)}})$$

where for $1 \leq k \leq j$ we set $F^{(k)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_k(\mathcal{F})$ and $\widehat{F^{(k)}} = [D_{k+1}(\mathcal{F})]_1$. In particular, $\widehat{F^{(j)}} = 0$.

Below we pictorially present $\sigma_{\mathcal{F}}$ in the context of our previous example for the case $\mathcal{F} = \{S_1, S_2, S_3\}$. The color blue corresponds to the color 1. The forest product of trees is represented by placing the trees next to each other but note that the order does not matter.



Given a forest of subtrees $\mathcal{F}$ we define $E_{\mathcal{F}} \subset E_{\overline{T}}$ via $E_{\mathcal{F}} = \bigsqcup_{S \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}} E_S$. The following lemma states how the action of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_-$ admits an expansion into forests.

Lemma 4.7 *Let $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq 1}$ and F be the i-forest corresponding to $\mathcal{F}$. Then for any node labeling $\mathfrak{n}$ on $N(F)$ one has*

$$\Big(\sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F}[\mathcal{F}]} \mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathcal{G}}} \Big) \hat{\mathcal{A}}_-(F,0)_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n}} = \hat{\mathcal{A}}_-(F,0)_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n}} . \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. We prove the statement via induction in $|E_F|$. The base case, when $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$ and $F = \mathbf{1}$, is trivial (the sum on the LHS of (4.3) just gives $\mathbf{P}_\emptyset$).

Now suppose F has $k > 0$ edges and the claim has been proven for all $\mathcal{F}' \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq 1}$ with $|E_{\mathcal{F}'}| < k$. Then $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_-(F,0)_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n}}$ is given by

$$- \sum_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F}_<[\mathcal{F}]} \sum_{\mathfrak{n}_G, \mathfrak{e}_G} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{e}_G!} \binom{\mathfrak{n}}{\mathfrak{n}_G} \Big(\hat{\mathcal{A}}_- \mathfrak{p}_-(G,0)_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}^{\mathfrak{n}_G + \chi \mathfrak{e}_G} \Big) \cdot (F, [G]_1)_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}} + \mathfrak{e}_G}^{\mathfrak{n} - \mathfrak{n}_G}$$

$$= - \sum_{\mathcal{G}\in\mathbb{F}_<[\mathcal{F}]} \sum_{\mathfrak{n}_G,\mathfrak{e}_G} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{e}_G!}\binom{\mathfrak{n}}{\mathfrak{n}_G}\Big(\sum_{\mathcal{G}'\in\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{G}]} \mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathcal{G}'}} \hat{\mathscr{A}}_-\mathfrak{p}_-(G,0)^{\mathfrak{n}_G+\chi\mathfrak{e}_G}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}\Big)\cdot (F,[G]_1)^{\mathfrak{n}-\mathfrak{n}_G}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}_G}$$

$$= - \sum_{\mathcal{G}\in\mathbb{F}_<[\mathcal{F}]} \sum_{\mathcal{G}'\in\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{G}]} \mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathcal{G}'\sqcup\mathcal{F}}} \sum_{\mathfrak{n}_G,\mathfrak{e}_G} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{e}_G!}\binom{\mathfrak{n}}{\mathfrak{n}_G}\Big(\hat{\mathscr{A}}_-\mathfrak{p}_-(G,0)^{\mathfrak{n}_G+\chi\mathfrak{e}_G}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}\Big)\cdot (F,[G]_1)^{\mathfrak{n}-\mathfrak{n}_G}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}_G}$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{G}\in\mathbb{F}_<[\mathcal{F}]\\ \mathcal{G}'\in\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{G}]}} \mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathcal{G}'\sqcup\mathcal{F}}}\Big[- \sum_{\substack{H\in\bar{\mathfrak{A}}_1(F,0)\\ \mathfrak{n}_H,\mathfrak{e}_H}} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{e}_H!}\binom{\mathfrak{n}}{\mathfrak{n}_H}\Big(\hat{\mathscr{A}}_-\mathfrak{p}_-(H,0)^{\mathfrak{n}_H+\chi\mathfrak{e}_H}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}\Big)\cdot (F,[H]_1)^{\mathfrak{n}-\mathfrak{n}_H}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}_H}\Big]$$

$$=\Big(\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{G}\in\mathbb{F}_<[\mathcal{F}]\\ \mathcal{G}'\in\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{G}]}} \mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathcal{G}'\sqcup\mathcal{F}}}\Big)\hat{\mathscr{A}}_-(F,0)^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}}$$

where for each $\mathcal{G}\in\mathbb{F}_<[\mathcal{F}]$ we are writing G for the i-forest corresponding to $\mathcal{G}$ (which is certainly an i-subforest of F). Noting that $\bigsqcup_{\mathcal{G}\in\mathbb{F}_<[\mathcal{F}]}\bigsqcup_{\mathcal{G}'\in\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{G}]}(\mathcal{G}'\sqcup\mathcal{F}) = \mathbb{F}[\mathcal{F}]$ completes the proof. □

We now mix our expansion into forests with a cumulant expansion. For any finite set L we denote by $\bar{\mathcal{P}}(L)$ the set of all partitions of L. We also define $\mathcal{P}(L) = \bigcup_{A\subset L}\bar{\mathcal{P}}(A)$. We remind the reader that $\bar{\mathcal{P}}(\emptyset)=\{\emptyset\}$.

Definition 4.8 Given $\pi\in\mathcal{P}[L(\bar{T})]$ and a forest of subtrees $\mathcal{F}$, we say $\mathcal{F}$ and π are *compatible* if, for each $S\in\mathcal{F}$, $L(S)$ can be written as union of blocks of π.

In sums over partitions or forests we sometimes write, as a subscript, "π comp. $\mathcal{F}$" to restrict the sum to compatible partitions. We also write $\mathbb{1}_{\text{comp}}(\mathcal{F},\pi)$ for the indicator function of the condition that $\mathcal{F}$ and π are compatible. Given a partition π, we write $\mathbb{F}_\pi$ for the collection of elements of $\mathbb{F}$ which are compatible with π.

We now introduce some notions to allow us to explicitly write down the negative renormalization procedure. For any subtree S, we set

$$K^{\downarrow}(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{e\in K(\bar{T}):\ e_{\text{p}}\in N(S),\ e_{\text{c}}\notin N(S)\},$$
$$\bar{K}^{\downarrow}(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K^{\downarrow}(S)\sqcup K(S),\ \text{and}\ N^{\downarrow}(S)\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e_{\text{c}}(K^{\downarrow}(S))\ .$$

We include a picture to make some of this notions clear. Below we shaded in a subtree S as before, but we additionally coloured ϱ_S in dark blue, the elements of $\tilde{N}(S)$ in light blue (recall that $\tilde{N}(S)=N(S)\setminus\{\varrho_S\}$), the elements of $N^{\downarrow}(S)$ in red, and the edges of $K^{\downarrow}(S)$ in light green.



Note that the zigzag at the top right does not belong to $\bar{K}^{\downarrow}(S)$ because $K(\overline{T})$ only contains "kernel edges" by definition.

For a pair of subtrees S, T with $T \leq S$ we define $K_T^{\partial}(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K^{\downarrow}(T) \cap K(S)$.

Given a forest of subtrees $\mathcal{F}$ and a subtree S we define

$$\tilde{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{N}(S) \setminus \Big(\bigsqcup_{T \in C_{\mathcal{F}}(S)} \tilde{N}(T) \Big), \quad N_{\mathcal{F}}(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(S) \sqcup \{\varrho_S\} \ .$$

We also use kernel edge decomposition

$$K(S) = \Big(\bigsqcup_{T \in C_{\mathcal{F}}(S)} K(T) \Big) \sqcup \mathring{K}_{\mathcal{F}}(S) \sqcup K_{\mathcal{F}}^{\partial}(S)$$

where

$$\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{F}}(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K(S) \setminus \Big(\bigsqcup_{T \in C_{\mathcal{F}}(S)} \bar{K}^{\downarrow}(T) \Big), \text{ and } K_{\mathcal{F}}^{\partial}(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigsqcup_{T \in C_{\mathcal{F}}(S)} K_T^{\partial}(S).$$

To keep track of leaf edges we set

$$L_{\mathcal{F}}(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L(S) \setminus \Big(\bigsqcup_{T \in C_{\mathcal{F}}(S)} L(T) \Big).$$

To make some of these definitions more concrete we look at the example of $\mathcal{F} = \{S_3, S_6\}$, referring to (4.1). Below we have shaded in S_6 in light gray and, on top of this, S_3 in dark gray. We also shaded the nodes of $N_{\mathcal{F}}(S_6)$ in light blue, the edge of $\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{F}}(S_6)$ in light green, and the edge of $K_{\mathcal{F}}^{\partial}(S_6) = K_{S_3}^{\partial}(S_6)$ in red. $L_{\mathcal{F}}(S_6)$ consists of just one edge which is the left uppermost zigzag.



Remark 4.9 For the rest of the paper we adopt the convention that any notation which takes a subtree of $\overline{T}$ as an argument can also take a collection of subtrees of $\overline{T}$ (not necessarily a forest) as an argument by taking unions over maximal elements. For example, for a collection $\mathcal{A}$ of subtrees we define

$$\tilde{N}(\mathcal{A}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{S \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}} \tilde{N}(S) \ , \quad L(\mathcal{A}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{S \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}} L(S) \ , \quad K^{\downarrow}(\mathcal{A}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{S \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}} K^{\downarrow}(S) \ ,$$

and so on.

We now introduce shorthand for the functions appearing in our integrands. For any set of kernel edges $E \subset K(\overline{T})$ and edge decoration $\mathfrak{e} : K(\overline{T}) \to \mathbf{N}^d$, we define the function $\mathrm{Ker}_{\mathfrak{e}}^E \in \mathscr{C}_A$ with $A = e_{\mathrm{p}}(E) \sqcup e_{\mathrm{c}}(E)$, by

$$\mathrm{Ker}_{\mathfrak{e}}^E(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{e \in E} D^{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}(e)+\mathfrak{e}(e)} K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}(x_{e_{\mathrm{p}}} - x_{e_{\mathrm{c}}}).$$

Given $u \in N^*$, we also define $\mathrm{Ker}_{\mathfrak{e}}^{E,u} \in \mathscr{C}_A$ with $A = \{u\} \sqcup e_{\mathrm{c}}(E)$, by

$$\mathrm{Ker}_{\mathfrak{e}}^{E,u}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{e \in E} D^{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}(e)+\mathfrak{e}(e)} K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}(x_u - x_{e_{\mathrm{c}}(e)}).$$

For any $L \subset L(\overline{T})$ and $\pi \in \mathcal{P}[L(\overline{T})]$ we define the function $\mathrm{Cu}_\pi^L \in \mathscr{C}_L$ by

$$\mathrm{Cu}_\pi^L(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{\substack{B \in \pi \\ B \subset L}} \mathbf{E}^c[\{\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(u)}(x_u)\}_{u \in B}],$$

where $\mathbf{E}^c$ denotes joint cumulants as before.

Finally, for any $N \subset N(\overline{T})$, $\mathfrak{n} : N \to \mathbf{N}^d$, and distinct $v, v' \in N^*$ we define the functions $\mathrm{X}_{\mathfrak{n}}^N$, $\mathrm{X}_{\mathfrak{n},v}^N$, $\mathrm{X}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{N,v}$, and $\mathrm{X}_{\mathfrak{n},v}^{N,v'} \in \mathscr{C}_*$ via

$$\mathrm{X}_{\mathfrak{n}}^N(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{u \in N} x_u^{\mathfrak{n}(u)}, \qquad \mathrm{X}_{\mathfrak{n},v}^N(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{u \in N} (x_u - x_v)^{\mathfrak{n}(u)}, \tag{4.4}$$

$$\mathrm{X}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{N,v}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (x_v)^{\sum_{u \in N} \mathfrak{n}(u)}, \quad \mathrm{X}_{\mathfrak{n},v}^{N,v'}(x) = (x_{v'} - x_v)^{\sum_{u \in N} \mathfrak{n}(u)}.$$

We also set $\overline{\mathrm{X}}_{\mathfrak{n}}^{N,v}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (-x_v)^{\sum_{u \in N} \mathfrak{n}(u)}$.

4.1.1 An inductive definition of negative renormalization counterterms

We will begin using multivariable multi-index notation more frequently: we take as a universe of multi-indices $(\mathbf{N}^d)^{N^* \sqcup K(\overline{T})}$. We define $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $|\cdot|$ for tuples of multi-indices by summation over entries.

Definition 4.10 Given a subtree S and any subset $A \subset N^*$ with $\tilde{N}(S) \subset A$, we define the "collapsing map" Coll_S onto the root of S as the map from $(\mathbf{R}^d)^A$ to itself given by

$$\mathrm{Coll}_S(x)_u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} x_{\varrho(S)} & \text{if } u \in \tilde{N}(S), \\ x_u & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This allows us to give the following definition.

Definition 4.11 For any subtree $S \in \mathrm{Div}$ we define $\mathrm{Der}(S)$ to be the set of all multi-indices k supported on $\tilde{N}(S)$ with $|k|_{\mathfrak{s}} < \omega(S)$. We also define an operator $\mathscr{Y}_S : \mathscr{C}_* \mapsto \mathscr{C}_*$ via

$$[\mathscr{Y}_S \varphi](x) \;=\; \sum_{k \in \mathrm{Der}(S)} \frac{(x - \mathrm{Coll}_S(x))^k}{k!} (D^k \varphi)(\mathrm{Coll}_S(x)) \;.$$

Here and below, given any set $M \subset N^*$, we write M^c for its complement in N^*.

We now inductively define, for each fixed $\pi \in \mathcal{P}[L(\overline{T})]$ and $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\pi$, operators $H_{\pi,\mathcal{F},S} : \mathscr{C}_* \to \mathscr{C}_*$ for each $S \in \mathcal{F}$. This induction will be with respect to depth of the forest of subtrees $\{T \in \mathcal{F} : T < S\}$. Moreover, for any $M \subset N^*$, the map $H_{\pi,\mathcal{F},S}$ maps $\mathscr{C}_M$ to $\mathscr{C}_{M \setminus \tilde{N}(S)}$.

The base case for our definition occurs when $C_{\mathcal{F}}(S) = \emptyset$ and, in that case, we set for any $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}_*$

$$[H_{\pi,\mathcal{F},S}(\varphi)](x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\tilde{N}(S)} dy \, \mathrm{Cu}_\pi^{L(S)}(y) \, \mathrm{Ker}_0^{K(S)}(y \sqcup x_{\varrho_S})(-\mathscr{Y}_S \varphi)(x_{\tilde{N}(S)^c} \sqcup y). \quad (4.5)$$

Remark 4.12 It is not hard to see that the integral above is absolutely convergent for fixed x. For each $e \in K(S)$ we have a uniform bound of the type

$$|D^{\bar{e}} K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}(y_{e_\mathrm{p}} - y_{e_\mathrm{c}})| \lesssim \mathbb{1}\big\{|y_{e_\mathrm{p}} - y_{e_\mathrm{c}}| \le 1\big\} \, |y_{e_\mathrm{p}} - y_{e_\mathrm{c}}|^{-|\mathfrak{s}|+|\mathfrak{t}(e)|_\mathfrak{s}-|\bar{\mathfrak{e}}(e)|_\mathfrak{s}}$$

where $|\mathfrak{t}(e)|_\mathfrak{s} - |\bar{\mathfrak{e}}(e)|_\mathfrak{s} > 0$ and any occurrence of y_{ϱ_S} should be replaced by x_{ϱ_S}. The edges of $K(S)$ form a tree on the vertices of $\tilde{N}(S)$ so the support of $\mathrm{Ker}_0^{K(S)}(y \sqcup x_{\varrho_S})$, when seen as a function of $y_{\tilde{N}(S)}$ for fixed x_{ϱ_S}, is compact. In particular, if the other parts of the integrand of (2.14) can be bounded uniformly in y by some constant, then the entire integral can be bounded by this constant times the the product of $L_1(\mathbf{R})$ norms of the functions $D^{\bar{e}} K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}(\cdot)$. This is clearly the case as both $\mathrm{Cu}_\pi^L(y)$ and $(-\mathscr{Y}_S \varphi)$ are continuous, and therefore bounded on compact sets.

Remark 4.13 A second question the reader may ask is what the definition (4.5) is trying to accomplish. The quantity defined from this formula is a renormalization counterterm. One interpretation of the need for renormalization is the following - while working on a problem one may see the appearance of a function F which fails to belong to L^1_{loc} in some region (say at the origin for a distribution on $\mathbf{R}^d$ or on the diagonal for a translation invariant distribution on $\mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R}^d$), so that it cannot be canonically identified with a distribution.

The insertion of a regularization parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ which disappears in the $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ limit may allow one to define a family of bonafide distributions F_ε but these may fail to converge in any meaningful sense as one takes $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

In many cases it is then possible to obtain a convergent family of distributions $\tilde{F}_\varepsilon$ by subtracting from each F_ε a well-chosen, ε-dependent linear combination of δ functions and their derivatives situated at these singular regions of F. A simple example is encountered when one tries to make sense of $F(t) = |t|^{-\alpha}$ for $\alpha > 1$ with $\alpha \notin \mathbf{N}$ as a distribution on $\mathbf{R}$. A convergent family of distributions can be obtained by defining

$$\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (|t| \vee \varepsilon)^{-\alpha} - \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \alpha \rfloor - 1} \Big(\int_{\mathbf{R}} ds \, \frac{s^j}{j!} (|s| \vee \varepsilon)^{-\alpha} \Big) \delta^{(j)}(t) \, ,$$

where $\delta^{(j)}$ denotes the j-th weak derivative of the delta function δ on $\mathbf{R}$. To derive good (uniform in ε) bounds on $\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(f)$ for a test function f one exploits a Taylor remainder estimate for f.

For an example closer to our circumstances, suppose that we have a single divergent subtree S which contains no divergent subtree. Then S can be associated to the distribution on $(\mathbf{R}^d)^{N(S)}$ given by integration against the function F_ε defined as

$$F_\varepsilon(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Cu}^L_{\varepsilon,\pi}(x)\mathrm{Ker}_0^{K(S)}(x).$$

We have made the regularization parameter explicit on the RHS. In practice all of our constructions will be applied to acceptable probability measures $\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon$ which converge to a limiting measure $\mathbb{P}$ with cumulants that are singular at coinciding points - in such a limit F_ε fails to be in $L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}[(\mathbf{R}^d)^{N^{\mathrm{ext}}(S)}]$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. The singular region occurs on the "small" diagonal - those $(x_v)_{v\in N(S)}$ with $x_v = x_{\varrho_S}$ for all v. The solution is to subtract an appropriate linear combination of delta functions and their derivatives on this diagonal, that is $F_\varepsilon(x) - \tilde{F}_\varepsilon(x)$ is given by

$$\sum_{k\in \mathrm{Der}(S)} \Big(\int_{\tilde{N}(S)} dy \, \frac{(y - \mathrm{Coll}_S(x))^k}{k!} F_\varepsilon(x_{\varrho_S} \sqcup y)\Big) \prod_{u\in\tilde{N}(S)} \delta^{(k_u)}(x_u - x_{\varrho_S}).$$

In general, $H_{\pi,\mathcal{F},S}$ is given recursively by

$$\begin{aligned}[H_{\pi,\mathcal{F},S}(\varphi)](x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} &\int_{\tilde{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(S)} dy \; \mathrm{Cu}_\pi^{L_{\mathcal{F}}(S)}(y)\mathrm{Ker}_0^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{F}}(S)}(y \sqcup x_{\varrho_S}) \\ &\cdot H_{\pi,\mathcal{F},C_{\mathcal{F}}(S)}\Big[\mathrm{Ker}_0^{K^\partial_{\mathcal{F}}(S)} \cdot (-\mathscr{Y}_S\varphi)\Big](x_{\tilde{N}(S)^c} \sqcup y) \, ,\end{aligned}$$

where $H_{\pi,\mathcal{F},C_{\mathcal{F}}(S)}$ denotes the composition of the operators $H_{\pi,\mathcal{F},T}$ for all $T \in C_{\mathcal{F}}(S)$. No order needs to be prescribed for this composition since, for any $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ which are disjoint, the operators $H_{\pi,\mathcal{F},T_1}$ and $H_{\pi,\mathcal{F},T_2}$ commute.

Let us sketch the argument showing that this is indeed the case. We first observe that for any $T \in \mathcal{F}$ and any $\psi \in \mathscr{C}_*$ which depends only on x_v with $v \notin \tilde{N}(T)$ one has

$$H_{\pi,\mathcal{F},T}[\varphi\psi] = \psi H_{\pi,\mathcal{F},T}[\varphi]. \tag{4.6}$$

Then one can unravel the inductive definition of $H_{\pi,\mathcal{F},T}$ to arrive at an expansion of the form

$$H_{\pi,\mathcal{F},T}[\varphi](x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{k\in\widetilde{\mathrm{Der}}(T)} (D^k\varphi)(\mathrm{Coll}_T(x)) \int_{\tilde{N}(T)} dy \; F_{T,k}(x_{N^\downarrow(T)} \sqcup y) \, , \tag{4.7}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathrm{Der}}(T)$ is some set of multi-indices supported on $\tilde{N}(T)$ and, for each k, $F_{T,k}$ is a product of combinatorial factors, derivatives of $\{D^{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}(e)}K_e\}_{e\in K(T)}$ evaluated on differences of $(x_v)_{v\in N(T)}$, and polynomials of those same differences. Using the combination of the observation (4.6), the symmetry of partial derivatives, and the fact that for for distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ one has $N^\downarrow(T_i)\cap\tilde{N}(T_j) = \tilde{N}(T_i)\cap\tilde{N}(T_j) = \emptyset$ it is straightforward to use the expansion (4.7) to prove the claimed commutation rule.

4.1.2 Deriving an explicit formula for negative renormalizations

In what follows, for any multi-index $\mathfrak{m}$ and real number r we write

$$\mathbb{1}_{<r}(\mathfrak{m}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{1}\{|\mathfrak{m}|_{\mathfrak{s}} < r\} \,.$$

We also define, for any three multi-indices $\mathfrak{n}$, $\mathfrak{m}$, $\mathfrak{e}$ and real number r,

$$\binom{\mathfrak{n}\ r}{\mathfrak{m}\ \mathfrak{e}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{e}!}\binom{\mathfrak{n}}{\mathfrak{m}}\mathbb{1}_{<r}(\mathfrak{m}+\mathfrak{e})$$

For any $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}$, any node decoration $\mathfrak{n}$ on $\overline{T}$, and any $\pi \in \mathcal{P}[L(\overline{T})]$ compatible with $\mathcal{F}$, we define a function $\mathring{\varpi}_\pi^{\mathfrak{n}}[\mathcal{F}] \in \mathcal{C}_*$ as follows. We set $\mathring{\varpi}_\pi^{\mathfrak{n}}[\emptyset] = 1$ and, for $\mathcal{F}$ non-empty, we set

$$\mathring{\varpi}_\pi^{\mathfrak{n}}[\mathcal{F}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left[\prod_{S\in\overline{\mathcal{F}}} \mathrm{Cu}_\pi^{L_{\mathcal{F}}(S)}\mathrm{Ker}_0^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{F}}(S)} H_{\pi,\mathcal{F},C_{\mathcal{F}}(S)}\left[X_{\mathfrak{n}}^{\tilde{N}(S)}\mathrm{Ker}_0^{K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{F}}(S)}\right]\right].$$

Lemma 4.14 *Let $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}$ and let F be the i-forest corresponding to $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$. Let $\mathfrak{n}$ be a node decoration on F vanishing on $\varrho(F)$. Then one has*

$$\bar{\Upsilon}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathcal{F}}}\hat{\mathscr{A}}_-(F,0)_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n}}\right] = (-1)^{|\overline{\mathcal{F}}|}\sum_{\substack{\pi\in\bar{\mathcal{P}}[L(\mathcal{F})]\\ \pi \text{ comp. } \mathcal{F}}}\int_{N_{\mathcal{F}}} dy\,\delta(y_{\varrho(\overline{\mathcal{F}})})\mathring{\varpi}_\pi^{\mathfrak{n}}[\mathcal{F}](y). \tag{4.8}$$

Proof. The case where $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$ holds trivially and we ignore this case below.

We work with the RHS of (4.8) and try to transform it to the LHS, working inductively in the depth of $\mathcal{F}$.

We first observe that (4.8) is forest multiplicative, that is we can write

$$\mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathcal{F}}}\hat{\mathscr{A}}_-(F,0)_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n}} = \prod_{S\in\overline{\mathcal{F}}}\mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathcal{F}_S}}\hat{\mathscr{A}}_-(S,0)_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n}} \,.$$

Both the integral and the sum over compatible partitions appearing in the RHS of (4.8) factorize analogously. It follows that for both the base step and the inductive step it suffices to treat the situation where there is a single maximal tree in $\mathcal{F}$, so $F = S$ for some subtree S.

We first treat the base case when $\mathcal{F}$ has depth 1. We then have

$$\mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\{S\}}}\hat{\mathscr{A}}_-(S,0)_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n}} = -(S,0)_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n}}$$

and it is straightforward to see that

$$\bar{\Upsilon}^{\mathbb{P}}[(S,0)_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\mathfrak{n}}] = -\sum_{\pi\in\bar{\mathcal{P}}[L(S)]}\int_{N(S)} dy\,\delta(y_{\varrho_S})\mathring{\varpi}_\pi^{\mathfrak{n}}[\{S\}](y).$$

We now treat the inductive case, we assume (4.8) is true for all forests of depth less than j and prove it for a forest $\mathcal{F}$ of depth j with $\overline{\mathcal{F}} = \{S\}$.

We write $\mathcal{G} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{F} \setminus \{S\}$ and G for the i-forest corresponding to $\overline{\mathcal{G}}$. For $T \in \overline{\mathcal{G}}$ we also write $\mathcal{G}_T = \{U \in \mathcal{F} : \, U \leq T\}$, observe that $\mathcal{G}_T$ is a forest of subtrees of depth less than j.

With this notation in hand we have

$$\mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathcal{F}}} \hat{\mathscr{A}}_-(S,0)^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}} = - \sum_{\mathfrak{n}_G,\, \mathfrak{e}_G} (S, [G]_1)^{\mathfrak{n}-\mathfrak{n}_G}_{\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{e}_G} \cdot \Big[\prod_{T \in \overline{\mathcal{G}}} \binom{\mathfrak{n}\ \omega(T)}{\mathfrak{n}_T\ \mathfrak{e}_T} \mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathcal{G}_T}} \hat{\mathscr{A}}_-(T,0)^{\mathfrak{n}_T + \chi \mathfrak{e}_T}_{\mathfrak{e}} \Big],$$

where above the sum is over node decorations $\mathfrak{n}_G$ on $N(G) \setminus \varrho(G)$ and edge decorations $\mathfrak{e}_G$ on $K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{F}}(S)$ - the edge decorations $\mathfrak{e}_T$ and node decorations $\mathfrak{n}_T$ are given by the restrictions of $\mathfrak{e}_G$ to $K^{\partial}_T(S)$ and $\mathfrak{n}_G$ to $\tilde{N}(T)$, respectively.

Expanding now the RHS of (4.8) and using the fact that every partition π of $L(S)$ compatible with $\mathcal{F}$ consists of a partition $\bar{\pi}$ of $L_{\mathcal{F}}(S)$ and, for every $T \in \bar{\mathcal{G}}$, a partition π_T compatible with $\mathcal{G}_T$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & - \sum_{\substack{\pi \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}[L(S)] \\ \pi \text{ comp. } \mathcal{F}}} \int_{N_{\mathcal{F}}(S)} dy\, \delta(y_{\varrho S}) \mathring{\varpi}^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\pi}[\mathcal{F}](y) \qquad (4.9) \\ & = - \sum_{\bar{\pi} \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}[L_{\mathcal{F}}(S)]} \int_{N_{\mathcal{F}}(S)} dy\, \delta(y_{\varrho S}) \mathrm{Cu}^{L_{\mathcal{F}}(S)}_{\bar{\pi}}(y) \mathrm{Ker}^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{F}}(S)}_0(y) X^{N_{\mathcal{F}}(S)}_{\mathfrak{n}}(y) \\ & \quad \cdot \prod_{T \in \overline{\mathcal{G}}} \Big[\sum_{\substack{\pi_T \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}[L(T)] \\ \pi_T \text{ comp. } \mathcal{G}_T}} H_{\pi_T, \mathcal{G}_T, T} \Big[\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(T)}_{\mathfrak{n}} \mathrm{Ker}^{K^{\partial}_T(S)}_0 \Big](y) \Big] \, . \end{aligned}$$

We want to expand the action of the $H_{\pi_T, \mathcal{G}_T, T}$ above. For any $T \in \overline{\mathcal{G}}$ one has, by the rules of of differential calculus and some manipulation of binomial coefficients,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{Y}_T \Big[\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(T)}_{\mathfrak{n}} \mathrm{Ker}^{K^{\partial}_T(S)}_0 \Big] &= \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathrm{Der}(T) \\ \mathfrak{e}_T}} \frac{\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(T)}_{j, \varrho_T}}{j!} \binom{j}{\chi \mathfrak{e}_T} \binom{\mathfrak{n}}{j - \chi \mathfrak{e}_T} \mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(T), \varrho_T}_{\mathfrak{n} - j + \chi \mathfrak{e}_T} \mathrm{Ker}^{K^{\partial}_T(S), \varrho_T}_{\mathfrak{e}_T} \\ &= \sum_{\mathfrak{n}_T, \mathfrak{e}_T} \binom{\mathfrak{n}\ \omega(T)}{\mathfrak{n}_T\ \mathfrak{e}_T} \mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(T)}_{\mathfrak{n}_T, \varrho_T} \mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(T), \varrho_T}_{\mathfrak{n} - \mathfrak{n}_T} \mathrm{Ker}^{K^{\partial}_T(S), \varrho_T}_{\mathfrak{e}_T} \end{aligned}$$

where we view $j \in \mathrm{Der}(T)$ as node decorations on $\tilde{N}(T)$. We can then write

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{\pi_T \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}[L(T)] \\ \pi_T \text{ comp. } \mathcal{G}_T}} H_{\pi_T, \mathcal{G}_T, T} \Big[\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(T)}_{\mathfrak{n}} \mathrm{Ker}^{K^{\partial}_T(S)}_0 \Big](y) \\ & = - \sum_{\substack{\pi_T \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}[L(T)] \\ \pi_T \text{ comp. } \mathcal{G}_T}} \sum_{\mathfrak{n}_T, \mathfrak{e}_T} \binom{\mathfrak{n}\ \omega(T)}{\mathfrak{n}_T\ \mathfrak{e}_T} \mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(T), \varrho_T}_{\mathfrak{n} - \mathfrak{n}_T}(y) \mathrm{Ker}^{K^{\partial}_T(S), \varrho_T}_{\mathfrak{e}_T}(y) \end{aligned}$$

$$\cdot \int_{\tilde{N}_{\mathcal{G}_T}(T)} dz\, \mathrm{Cu}_{\pi_T}^{L_{\mathcal{G}_T}(T)}(z) \mathrm{Ker}_0^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{G}_T}(T)}(z \sqcup y_{\varrho_T})$$
$$\cdot H_{\pi_T, \mathcal{G}_T, C_{\mathcal{G}_T}(T)} \Big[\mathrm{Ker}_0^{K^\partial_{\mathcal{G}_T}(T)} \mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(T)}_{\mathfrak{n}_T, \varrho_T} \Big] (y_{N^\partial_T(S)} \sqcup y_{\varrho_T} \sqcup z).$$

By translation invariance, the final integral does not depend on the value of y_{ϱ_T}. We can therefore replace y_{ϱ_T} with 0, which makes $\mathring{\varpi}^{\mathfrak{n}_T}_{\pi_T}$ appear. By our induction hypothesis, the above quantity is thus equal to

$$-\sum_{\mathfrak{n}_T, \mathfrak{e}_T} \binom{\mathfrak{n}\ \omega(T)}{\mathfrak{n}_T\ \mathfrak{e}_T} \mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(T), \varrho_T}_{\mathfrak{n}-\mathfrak{n}_T}(y)\, \mathrm{Ker}^{K^\partial_T(S), \varrho_T}_{\mathfrak{e}_T}(y)\, \bar{\Upsilon}^{\mathbb{P}} \Big[\mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathcal{G}_T}} \hat{\mathscr{A}}_-(T,0)^{\mathfrak{n}_T}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}} \Big].$$

Inserting this into the last line of (4.9) for each $T \in \overline{\mathcal{G}}$ gives

$$\sum_{\bar{\pi} \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}[L_{\mathcal{F}}(S)]} \int_{N_{\mathcal{F}}(S)} dy\, \delta(y_{\varrho_S})\, \mathrm{Cu}^{L_{\mathcal{F}}(S)}_{\bar{\pi}}(y)\, \mathrm{Ker}_0^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{F}}(S)}(y)\, X^{N_{\mathcal{F}}(S)}_{\mathfrak{n}}(y)$$
$$\cdot \Big[\prod_{T \in \overline{\mathcal{G}}} \sum_{\mathfrak{n}_T, \mathfrak{e}_T} \binom{\mathfrak{n}\ \omega(T)}{\mathfrak{n}_T\ \mathfrak{e}_T} \mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(T), \varrho_T}_{\mathfrak{n}-\mathfrak{n}_T}(y)\, \mathrm{Ker}^{K^\partial_T(S), \varrho_T}_{\mathfrak{e}_T}(y)\, \bar{\Upsilon}^{\mathbb{P}} \Big[\mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathcal{G}_T}} \hat{\mathscr{A}}_-(T,0)^{\mathfrak{n}_T + \chi \mathfrak{e}_T}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}} \Big] \Big]$$
$$= -\sum_{\mathfrak{n}_G,\ \mathfrak{e}_G} \bar{\Upsilon}^{\mathbb{P}} \Big[(S, [G]_1)^{\mathfrak{n}-\mathfrak{n}_G}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}_G} \Big] \Big(\prod_{T \in \overline{\mathcal{G}}} \binom{\mathfrak{n}\ \omega(T)}{\mathfrak{n}_T\ \mathfrak{e}_T} \bar{\Upsilon}^{\mathbb{P}} \Big[\mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathcal{G}_T}} \hat{\mathscr{A}}_-(T,0)^{\mathfrak{n}_T + \chi \mathfrak{e}_T}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}} \Big] \Big).$$

□

4.2 A cutting formula for positive renormalizations

In the previous subsection we saw that the relevant substructures of $\overline{T}$ with regards to negative renormalizations were the subtrees of $\overline{T}$ of negative homogeneity. The analogous substructures of $\overline{T}$ for positive renormalizations will be edges in $K(\overline{T})$ which are "trunks" of subtrees of $\overline{T}$ of positive homogeneity.

We frequently reference our chosen poset structure on $K(\overline{T})$, namely $e \le \bar{e}$ if and only if the unique path of edges from $\bar{e}_{\mathrm{c}}$ to the root ϱ_* of $\overline{T}$ contains e.

For $\mathscr{C} \subset K(\overline{T})$, $e \in K(\overline{T})$, the set of immediate children of e in $\mathscr{C}$ is given by

$$C_{\mathscr{C}}(e) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Min}(\{\bar{e} \in \mathscr{C} :\ \bar{e} > e\}).$$

For a subset $\mathscr{C} \subset K(\overline{T})$ we define the subtrees and sub-forests

$$\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcap_{e \in \mathscr{C}} \overline{T}_{\not\geq}(e) \text{ and } \mathfrak{T}_{\geq}[\mathscr{C}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{T}(\overline{T}, \overline{T}_{\not\geq}(\mathscr{C}))\ ,$$

where we adopt the convention $\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\emptyset] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \overline{T}$ and $\mathfrak{T}[\cdot,\cdot]$ is as in Definition 3.5. Note that while $\mathfrak{T}_{\geq}[\mathscr{C}]$ is a collection of subtrees of $\overline{T}$ it will in general *not* be a forest of subtrees since distinct elements of $\mathfrak{T}_{\geq}[\mathscr{C}]$ may share roots.

Observe that both $\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}]$ and $\mathfrak{T}_{\geq}[\mathscr{C}]$ depend on $\mathscr{C}$ only through $\mathrm{Min}(\mathscr{C})$ and that $\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}]$ always contains as a subtree the trivial tree consisting only of ϱ_*.

Remark 4.15 In what follows we will begin writing co-action extraction / colorings as sums over sets of edges. It then makes sense to label the resulting sums over decorations with sets of edges rather than the subtrees they correspond to. Namely, if $\mathscr{C} \subset K(\overline{T})$ then a sum over $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{C}}$ corresponds to a sum over node decorations which are supported on $N(T_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}])$ while a sum over $\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{C}}$ corresponds a sum over edge-derivative decorations which are supported on $\underline{\mathscr{C}}$.

Definition 4.16 We say $e \in K(\overline{T})$ is a *positive cut* if

$$\left|\tilde{P}(\overline{T}_{\geq}(e), 0)^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\overline{\mathfrak{e}}}\right|_+ > 0 \,,$$

where $\tilde{P}$ is the map mentioned before which zeroes node labels at roots (this map naturally induces a map on i-forests).

We denote by $\mathfrak{C} \subset K(\overline{T})$ the collection of all positive cuts and define a function $\gamma : \mathfrak{C} \to \mathbf{N}$ via

$$\gamma(e) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\lceil \left|\tilde{P}(\overline{T}_{\geq}(e), 0)^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\overline{\mathfrak{e}}}\right|_+ \right\rceil .$$

The key role of the extended node-label $\mathfrak{o}$ is to store information so that the negative renormalizations from $\hat{\Delta}_-$ do not cause $\hat{\Delta}_+$ or $\hat{\mathscr{A}}_+$ to make *additional* positive renormalizations.

We now take advantage of this to help us unravel the action of $\hat{\mathscr{A}}_+$. First recall that any i-tree can be realized as a subtree of $\overline{T}$. We define $\mathfrak{T}_+$ to be the collection of all decorated i-trees of the form $(\overline{T}, \hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \underline{\mathfrak{T}_2}$ with the properties that (i) $\mathfrak{e} \geq \overline{\mathfrak{e}}$ and (ii) for every $e \in K(\overline{T})$ with $\hat{T}(e_{\mathrm{p}}) \neq 2$ and $\hat{T}(e) = 0$ one has

$$\left|\tilde{P}(\overline{T}_{\geq}(e), 0)^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\overline{\mathfrak{e}}}\right|_+ = \left|\tilde{P}(\overline{T}_{\geq}(e), \hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}}\right|_+ + |\mathfrak{e}(e) - \overline{\mathfrak{e}}(e)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \,.$$

We then have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.17 *One has*

$$\hat{\Delta}_1(\overline{T}, 0)^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \langle \mathfrak{F}_0 \rangle \otimes \langle \underline{\mathfrak{T}_1} \cap \mathfrak{T}_+ \rangle$$
$$\text{and } (\mathrm{Id} \otimes \hat{\Delta}_2)\hat{\Delta}_1(\overline{T}, 0)^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \langle \mathfrak{F}_0 \rangle \otimes \langle \underline{\mathfrak{T}_1} \rangle \otimes \langle \mathfrak{T}_+ \cap \underline{\hat{\mathfrak{T}}_2} \rangle .$$

Given $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ and $k \in \mathbf{N}$ we define subsets $D_k(\mathscr{C})$ of $\mathscr{C}$ as follows. We set $D_0(\mathscr{C}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \emptyset$, $D_1(\mathscr{C}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \underline{\mathscr{C}}$, and for $k > 1$ we set

$$D_k(\mathscr{C}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigsqcup_{e \in D_{k-1}(\mathscr{C})} C_{\mathscr{C}}(e).$$

We define the depth of $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ via

$$\text{depth}(\mathscr{C}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf\left\{k \in \mathbf{N} : \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{k} D_j(\mathscr{C}) = \mathscr{C}\right\} = \inf\{k \geq 0 : \; D_{k+1}(\mathscr{C}) = \emptyset\} \,.$$

Below we draw a picture to clarify these notions. We have drawn a tree $\overline{T}$, but have neglected to draw any leaf edges or any of the fictitious nodes attached to their ends. The set $\mathscr{C} \subset K(\overline{T})$ consists of all edges which have a non-zero number of tick marks. For $k \geq 1$ the set $D_k(\mathscr{C})$ then consists of those edges with k tick marks. We see that the set $\mathscr{C}$ has depth 3.



For any $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ we define $\mathrm{Div}_{\mathscr{C}}$ to be the collection of those $T \in \mathrm{Div}$ such that $\mathscr{C} \cap K(T) = \emptyset$. We define $\mathbb{F}_{\mathscr{C}}$ to be the set of all forests $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}$ with $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathrm{Div}_{\mathscr{C}}$.

Conversely, for any $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}$ we define $\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{C} \setminus K(\mathcal{F})$ so that $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Div}_{\mathscr{C}}$ if and only if $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}$.

For any $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Div}_{\mathscr{C}}$ we also define

$$\mathcal{F}[\mathscr{C}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{T \in \mathcal{F} : T \leq S \text{ for some } S \in \mathfrak{T}_{\geq}[\mathscr{C}]\} \ .$$

Additionally, for $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}$ and $\mathscr{C}, \mathscr{D} \subset \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}$ we define

$$\mathcal{F}[\mathscr{C}, \mathscr{D}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{T \in \mathcal{F}[\mathscr{C}] : T \leq \overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{D}]\} \ .$$

Definition 4.18 Given $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Div}_{\mathscr{C}}$ we define $\sigma_{\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}} \in \mathring{\mathring{\mathfrak{T}}}$ as follows.

If $\mathscr{C} = \emptyset$ then we set $\sigma_{\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\overline{T}, 2)$. Otherwise $\mathscr{C}$ must be of depth $k \geq 1$ in which case we set

$$\sigma_{\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (T^{(1)}, \widehat{T^{(1)}}) \cdots (T^{(k)}, \widehat{T^{(k)}}), \tag{4.10}$$

where each of the trees $T^{(j)}$ are subtrees of $\overline{T}$ and for $1 \leq j \leq k$ one has

- $T^{(j)} = \overline{T}_{\not\geq}[D_{j+1}(\mathscr{C})]$,
- $\widehat{T^{(j)}} = [\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[D_j(\mathscr{C})]]_2 \sqcup \left[\overline{\mathcal{F}[D_j(\mathscr{C}), D_{j+1}(\mathscr{C})]}\right]_1$.

We present a pictorial example to clarify the above definitions. We let $\overline{T}$ and $\mathscr{C}$ be as in the immediately previous pictorial example and set $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$. The tree $\sigma_{\mathscr{C},\emptyset}$ is

then given by the forest product (written in the same order as in (4.10))



(4.11)

We now want to state the analogues of Lemmas 4.7 and 4.14 for positive renormalizations.

We denote by $\mathfrak{C}^{\leq 1}$ the collection of all subsets $\mathfrak{C}$ with depth 0 or 1 and also set $\mathfrak{C}^{\leq 1}_{\mathcal{F}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{C}^{\leq 1} \cap 2^{\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}}$. For any $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_{\mathscr{C}}$ we define a coloring on $\overline{T}$ given by

$$\hat{\overline{T}}[\mathscr{C}, \mathcal{F}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left[\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}]\right]_2 \sqcup \left[\overline{\mathcal{F}[\mathscr{C}]}\right]_1 .$$

and use the shorthand $\overline{T}[\mathscr{C}, \mathcal{F}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\overline{T}, \hat{\overline{T}}[\mathscr{C}, \mathcal{F}])$.

For our previous example with $\overline{T}$ and $\mathscr{C}$ one has $(\overline{T}, \hat{\overline{T}}[\mathscr{C}, \emptyset])$ given by



Such i-trees will be produced by the action of $\hat{\Delta}_+$, the action of $\hat{\mathscr{A}}_+$ corresponds to iteratively pulling out more structures, always acting to the right.

Heuristically the tree $\sigma_{\mathscr{C},\emptyset}$ is one of the terms appearing in the expansion of $\hat{\mathscr{A}}_+(\overline{T}, \hat{\overline{T}}[\mathscr{C}, \emptyset])$. Working through the action of $\hat{\mathscr{A}}_+$ on $(\overline{T}, \hat{\overline{T}}[\mathscr{C}, \emptyset])$ as specified through its recursive definition, after one step of the recursion many terms will be generated but the term giving rise to $\sigma_{\mathscr{C},\emptyset}$ is



(4.12)

The term $\sigma_{\mathscr{C},\emptyset}$ then appears from the above term when one goes one step further in the recursive definition of $\hat{\mathscr{A}}_+$, namely by pulling out the middle tree of (4.11) from the second tree of (4.12). We define the collection of cut sets

$$\mathfrak{C}[\mathscr{C}, \mathcal{F}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathscr{D} \subset \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}} : \underline{\mathscr{D}} = \mathscr{C}\}, \tag{4.13}$$

$$\mathfrak{C}_<[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big\{ \mathscr{D} \in \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\leq 1} : \forall e \in \mathscr{D},\ \exists e' \in \mathscr{C} \text{ with } e' < e \Big\} .$$

Also, for any $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$, $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_{\mathscr{C}}$, and $\mathscr{D} \in \mathfrak{C}_<[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]$ we set

$$\overline{T}[\mathscr{C},\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big(\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{D}], [\overline{\mathcal{F}[\mathscr{C},\mathscr{D}]}]_1 \sqcup [\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}]]_2 \Big).$$

With all this notation in hand we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.19 *Let $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}$ and $\mathscr{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\leq 1}$. Then for any node decoration $\mathfrak{n}$, edge decoration $\mathfrak{e}$, and extended node label $\mathfrak{o}$ on $\overline{T}$ such that $\overline{T}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}} \in \mathfrak{T}_+$ one has*

$$\Big(\sum_{\mathscr{D} \in \mathfrak{C}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]} \mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}}} \Big) \hat{\mathcal{A}}_+ \overline{T}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}} = \hat{\mathcal{A}}_+ \overline{T}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}} .$$

Proof. Our proof operates inductively in the quantity

$$|E_{\overline{T}} \setminus E_{\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}]}|, \tag{4.14}$$

with $\mathcal{F}$ being fixed for the entire proof. The base case of this induction, which occurs when the (4.14) is 0, is immediate since we then have $\overline{T}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}] = (\overline{T}, 2)$ - we then have $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_+(\overline{T},2)^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}} = (-1)^{|\mathfrak{n}|}(\overline{T},2)^{0,0}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}}$.

We now turn to the proving the inductive step. Fix $j \in \mathbf{N}$, and suppose the claim has been proven for any $\mathscr{C}$ with $\mathscr{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\leq 1}$ and (4.14) less than j.

Then suppose we are given $\mathscr{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\leq 1}$ with (4.14) equal to $j+1$. Then we have $(-1)^{|\mathscr{C}|+|\hat{\mathfrak{n}}|}\hat{\mathcal{A}}_+\overline{T}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\mathscr{D} \in \mathfrak{C}_<[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]} \sum_{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}},\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}},\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}} \frac{(-1)^{|\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}|}}{(\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}+\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}})!} \binom{\mathfrak{n}-\hat{\mathfrak{n}}}{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}} \overline{T}[\mathscr{C},\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}]^{\hat{\mathfrak{n}}+\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}+\chi(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}+\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}})}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}} \\
&\qquad\qquad \cdot \hat{\mathcal{A}}_+ \mathfrak{p}_+ \overline{T}[\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}]^{\mathfrak{n}-\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}-\hat{\mathfrak{n}},\mathfrak{o}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}} \\
=&\sum_{\mathscr{D} \in \mathfrak{C}_<[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]} \sum_{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}},\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}},\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}} \frac{(-1)^{|\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}|}}{(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}+\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}})!} \binom{\mathfrak{n}-\hat{\mathfrak{n}}}{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}} \overline{T}[\mathscr{C},\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}]^{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}+\hat{\mathfrak{n}}+\chi(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}+\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}})}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}} \\
&\qquad\qquad \cdot \sum_{\mathscr{E} \in \mathfrak{C}[\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}]} \mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathscr{E},\mathcal{F}}} \overline{T}[\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}]^{\mathfrak{n}-\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}-\hat{\mathfrak{n}},\mathfrak{o}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}} \\
=&\sum_{\substack{\mathscr{D} \in \mathfrak{C}_<[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}] \\ \mathscr{E} \in \mathfrak{C}[\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}]}} \mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathscr{E}\sqcup\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}}} \sum_{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}},\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}},\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}} \frac{(-1)^{|\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}|}}{(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}+\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}})!} \binom{\mathfrak{n}}{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}} \overline{T}[\mathscr{C},\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}]^{\hat{\mathfrak{n}}+\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}+\chi(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}+\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}})}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}} \\
&\qquad\qquad \cdot \hat{\mathcal{A}}_+ \mathfrak{p}_+ \overline{T}[\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}]^{\mathfrak{n}-\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}-\hat{\mathfrak{n}},\mathfrak{o}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}} \\
=&(-1)^{|\mathscr{C}|+|\hat{\mathfrak{n}}|} \Big(\sum_{\substack{\mathscr{D} \in \mathfrak{C}_<[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}] \\ \mathscr{E} \in \mathfrak{C}[\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}]}} \mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathscr{E}\sqcup\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}}} \Big) \hat{\mathcal{A}}_+ \overline{T}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\mathfrak{n}} = \mathfrak{n}(N(T_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}]))$ and the sum over $\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}$ is a sum over edge decorations $\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}} \in \mathfrak{E}[\overline{T}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}}]$. Since

$$\bigsqcup_{\mathscr{D}\in\mathfrak{C}_<[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]} \bigsqcup_{\mathscr{E}\in\mathfrak{C}[\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}]} (\mathscr{C}\sqcup\mathscr{E}) = \mathfrak{C}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]\,,$$

the result follows. □

Remark 4.20 Clearly, the statement of Lemma 4.19 holds if we relax the condition $\mathscr{C} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\leq 1}_{\mathcal{F}}$ to just that $\mathscr{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}$ provided one modifies what's written on the RHS and sums over $\mathscr{D} \in \mathfrak{C}[\underline{\mathscr{C}},\mathcal{F}]$.

We now introduce some more notation to facilitate writing explicit formulas for the integrands corresponding to the output of the positive twisted antipode.

For any $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$, and $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_{\mathscr{C}}$, and $\mathscr{D} \in \mathfrak{C}_<[\mathscr{C},\mathscr{D}]$ we define, using the convention of Remark 4.9,

$$\tilde{N}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{N}(\mathfrak{T}_{\geq}[\mathscr{C}]) \setminus \tilde{N}(\mathcal{F}), K[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K(\mathfrak{T}_{\geq}[\mathscr{C}]) \setminus (K(\mathcal{F}) \sqcup \mathscr{C}),$$
$$L_{\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L(\mathfrak{T}_{\geq}[\mathscr{C}]) \setminus L(\mathcal{F})\,.$$

For any $\mathscr{D} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ and edge decoration $\mathfrak{e}$ we define $\mathrm{RKer}^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \mathscr{C}_*$, depending on x_v with $v \in e_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathscr{D}) \sqcup e_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathscr{D}) \sqcup \{\circledast\}$, via

$$\mathrm{RKer}^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathfrak{e}}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (-1)^{|\mathscr{D}|} \prod_{e\in\mathscr{D}} \sum_{|k|_{\mathfrak{s}}<\gamma(e)-|\mathfrak{e}(e)|_{\mathfrak{s}}} \frac{(x_{e_{\mathrm{p}}} - x_{\circledast})^k}{k!}\, D^{k+\bar{\mathfrak{e}}(e)+\mathfrak{e}(e)} K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}(x_{\circledast} - x_{e_{\mathrm{c}}}).$$

For any $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ and edge decoration $\mathfrak{e}$ on $K(\overline{T})$ we define $\mathrm{Der}(\mathscr{C},\mathfrak{e})$ to be the set of all edge decorations $\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}$ supported on $\underline{\mathscr{C}}$ with the property that for every $e \in \underline{\mathscr{C}}$ one has $|\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}(e)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq \gamma(e) - |\mathfrak{e}(e)|_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

For any node decoration $\mathfrak{n}$ on $N(T)$ with $\mathfrak{n} \leq \bar{\mathfrak{n}}$ and edge decoration $\mathfrak{e}$ on $K(\overline{T})$ we define $\ddot{\varpi}^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}](x) \in \mathscr{C}_*$, depending on x_v with $v \in \tilde{N}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}] \sqcup \{\circledast\}$, by setting

$$\ddot{\varpi}^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{RKer}^{\mathscr{C}\setminus\underline{\mathscr{C}}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \cdot \mathrm{Ker}^{K[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]}_{\mathfrak{e}} \cdot \Big(\sum_{\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}\in\mathrm{Der}(\mathscr{C},\mathfrak{e})} \frac{\mathrm{Ker}^{\underline{\mathscr{C}},\circledast}_{\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}}}{\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}!} \overline{\mathrm{X}}^{e_{\mathrm{p}}(\underline{\mathscr{C}}),\circledast}_{\chi\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}} \Big)$$
$$\cdot \Big(\prod_{T\in\overline{\mathcal{F}[\mathscr{C}]}} \mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(T),\varrho_T}_{\mathfrak{n},\circledast} \Big) \cdot \mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]}_{\mathfrak{n},\circledast} \cdot \overline{\mathrm{X}}^{N(\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}]),\circledast}_{\mathfrak{n}}\,.$$

Finally, for an edge decoration $\mathfrak{e}$ and $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ we define an indicator function

$$\mathbb{1}^{\mathscr{C}}_{<\gamma}(\mathfrak{e}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{e\in\mathscr{C}} \mathbb{1}\{|\mathfrak{e}(e)|_{\mathfrak{s}} < \gamma(e)\}$$

Lemma 4.21 *Let $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ be non-empty and $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_{\mathscr{C}}$. Then for any node decoration $\mathfrak{n}$ on $N(T)$ with $\mathfrak{n} \leq \overline{\mathfrak{n}}$ and edge decoration $\mathfrak{e}$ on $K(\overline{T})$ one has*

$$\begin{aligned}\Upsilon^{\xi}\Big[\mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}}}\hat{\mathscr{A}}_+\overline{T}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\overline{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}}\Big](x_\otimes) \\ = (-1)^{|\underline{\mathscr{C}}|}\int_{\tilde{N}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]} dy\; \ddot{\varpi}^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}](y \sqcup x_\otimes)\Big(\prod_{u\in L_{\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}}}\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(u)}(y_u)\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Proof. We prove the statement by induction in depth($\mathscr{C}$) for fixed $\mathcal{F}$. The base case, when $\mathscr{C} = \emptyset$, is a straightforward computation.

We move to the inductive step. Fix $j \in \mathbf{N}$ and suppose the claim has been proven for any $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}$ with depth($\mathscr{C}$) $\leq j$. Now suppose we are given $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}$ with depth($\mathscr{C}$) $= j+1$. Writing $\mathscr{D} = \mathscr{C} \setminus \underline{\mathscr{C}}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{n}} = \overline{\mathfrak{n}}(T_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}])$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}}}\hat{\mathscr{A}}_+\hat{T}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\overline{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}} \\ &\quad= (-1)^{|\mathscr{C}|+|\hat{\mathfrak{n}}|}\sum_{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}},\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}},\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}}\frac{(-1)^{|\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}|}}{(\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}+\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}})!}\binom{\mathfrak{n}-\hat{\mathfrak{n}}}{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}}\overline{T}[\mathscr{C},\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}]^{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}+\chi(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}+\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}})+\hat{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\overline{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}} \\ &\qquad\cdot\hat{\mathscr{A}}_+\mathfrak{p}_+\overline{T}[\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}]^{\mathfrak{n}-\hat{\mathfrak{n}}-\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}},\mathfrak{o}}_{\overline{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}}\cdot\mathbb{1}^{\mathscr{D}}_{<\gamma}(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}+\mathfrak{e})\cdot\mathbb{1}^{\mathscr{C}}_{<\gamma}(\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}+\mathfrak{e}).\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

We start rewriting the corresponding RHS of (4.15). By the binomial identity one has

$$\begin{aligned}&\overline{\mathrm{X}}^{N(\overline{T}),\otimes}_{\hat{\mathfrak{n}}}\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]}_{\mathfrak{n}-\hat{\mathfrak{n}},\otimes}\Big(\prod_{T\in\overline{\mathcal{F}[\mathscr{C}]}}\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(T),\varrho_T}_{\mathfrak{n}-\hat{\mathfrak{n}},\otimes}\Big) \\ &=\sum_{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}}\binom{\mathfrak{n}-\hat{\mathfrak{n}}}{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}}\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]\cap N(\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{D}])}_{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}}\Big(\prod_{T\in\overline{\mathcal{F}[\mathscr{C},\mathscr{D}]}}\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(T),\varrho_T}_{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}}\Big)\overline{\mathrm{X}}^{N(\overline{T}),\otimes}_{\hat{\mathfrak{n}}} \\ &\quad\cdot\overline{\mathrm{X}}^{N(\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{D}]),\otimes}_{\mathfrak{n}-\hat{\mathfrak{n}}-\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}}\cdot\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]}_{\mathfrak{n}-\hat{\mathfrak{n}}-\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}},\otimes}\cdot\Big(\prod_{T\in\overline{\mathcal{F}[\mathscr{D}]}}\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(T),\varrho_T}_{\mathfrak{n}-\hat{\mathfrak{n}}-\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}},\otimes}\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

where in keeping with our convention, the sum over $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}$ is a sum over node decorations supported on $N(\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{D}])$ - however that the binomial coefficient forces it to be supported on $N(\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{D}]) \setminus N(\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}])$.

We also have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{RKer}^{\underline{\mathscr{D}}}_{\mathfrak{e}} &= (-1)^{|\underline{\mathscr{D}}|}\sum_{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}}\frac{1}{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}!}\mathrm{X}^{e_{\mathrm{p}}(\underline{\mathscr{D}})}_{\chi\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}},\otimes}\cdot\mathrm{Ker}^{\otimes,\underline{\mathscr{D}}}_{\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}}\mathbb{1}^{\underline{\mathscr{D}}}_{<\gamma}(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}+\mathfrak{e}) \\ &= (-1)^{|\underline{\mathscr{D}}|}\sum_{\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{D}},\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}}\frac{1}{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}!}\binom{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}}{\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{D}}}\mathrm{X}^{e_{\mathrm{p}}(\underline{\mathscr{D}})}_{\chi(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}-\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{D}}),\otimes}\overline{\mathrm{X}}^{e_{\mathrm{p}}(\underline{\mathscr{D}}),\otimes}_{\chi\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{D}}}\mathrm{Ker}^{\otimes,\underline{\mathscr{D}}}_{\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}}\mathbb{1}^{\underline{\mathscr{D}}}_{<\gamma}(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}+\mathfrak{e}) \\ &= (-1)^{|\underline{\mathscr{D}}|}\sum_{\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{D}},\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}}\frac{1}{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}!}\frac{1}{\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{D}}!}\mathrm{X}^{e_{\mathrm{p}}(\underline{\mathscr{D}})}_{\chi\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}},\otimes}\overline{\mathrm{X}}^{e_{\mathrm{p}}(\underline{\mathscr{D}}),\otimes}_{\chi\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{D}}}\mathrm{Ker}^{\otimes,\underline{\mathscr{D}}}_{\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}+\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{D}}} \\ &\qquad\cdot\mathbb{1}^{\underline{\mathscr{D}}}_{<\gamma}(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}+\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{D}}+\mathfrak{e})\end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

$$= (-1)^{|\underline{\mathscr{D}}|} \sum_{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}!} \mathrm{X}^{e_{\mathrm{p}}(\underline{\mathscr{D}})}_{\chi \mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}, \circledast} \Big(\sum_{\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{D}} \in \mathrm{Der}(\mathscr{D}, \mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}})} \frac{\mathrm{Ker}^{\circledast, \underline{\mathscr{D}}}_{\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}+\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{D}}}}{\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{D}}!} \overline{\mathrm{X}}^{e_{\mathrm{p}}(\underline{\mathscr{D}}), \circledast}_{\chi \mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{D}}} \Big)$$

where in going to the second line we used the binomial identity and in going to the third line we performed a change of summation $\mathfrak{e}'_{\mathscr{D}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}} - \mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{D}}$. Note that there is an indicator function $\mathbb{1}^{\underline{\mathscr{D}}}_{<\gamma}(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}} + \mathfrak{e})$ implicit in the last line, when this vanishes $\mathrm{Der}(\mathscr{D}, \mathfrak{e} + \mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}})$ is empty.

Using (4.18) we have that $\mathrm{Ker}^{K[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]}_{\mathfrak{e}} \mathrm{RKer}^{\mathscr{C} \setminus \underline{\mathscr{C}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}$ is equal to

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}} \mathbb{1}^{\underline{\mathscr{D}}}_{<\gamma}(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}} + \mathfrak{e}) \frac{1}{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}!} \mathrm{Ker}^{K[\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}]}_{\mathfrak{e}} \mathrm{RKer}^{\mathscr{D} \setminus \underline{\mathscr{D}}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \tag{4.19}$$

$$\cdot \, \mathrm{Ker}^{K[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}] \cap K(T_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{D}])}_{\mathfrak{e}} (-1)^{|\underline{\mathscr{D}}|} \mathrm{X}^{e_{\mathrm{p}}(\underline{\mathscr{D}})}_{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}, \circledast} \Big(\sum_{\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{D}} \in \mathrm{Der}(\mathscr{D}, \mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}})} \frac{\mathrm{Ker}^{\circledast, \underline{\mathscr{D}}}_{\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}+\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{D}}}}{\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{D}}!} \overline{\mathrm{X}}^{e_{\mathrm{p}}(\underline{\mathscr{D}}), \circledast}_{\chi \mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{D}}} \Big)$$

We then put this all together to see that the RHS of (4.15) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
&(-1)^{|\mathscr{C}|} \sum_{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}, \mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}, \mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}} \frac{1}{(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}} + \mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}})!} \binom{\mathfrak{n}}{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}} \mathbb{1}^{\underline{\mathscr{D}}}_{<\gamma}(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}} + \mathfrak{e}) \cdot \mathbb{1}^{\mathscr{C}}_{<\gamma}(\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}(e) + \mathfrak{e}(e)) \\
&\cdot \int dy_{\tilde{N}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}] \setminus \tilde{N}[\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}]} \, \mathrm{X}^{e_{\mathrm{p}}(\underline{\mathscr{D}})}_{\chi \mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}, \circledast}(y \sqcup x_{\circledast}) \mathrm{Ker}^{\underline{\mathscr{D}}, \circledast}_{\mathfrak{e}}(y \sqcup x_{\circledast}) \mathrm{Ker}^{K[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}] \cap K(T_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{D}])}_{\mathfrak{e}}(y) \\
&\quad \cdot \mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}] \cap \tilde{N}(T_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{D}])}_{\mathfrak{n}_S}(y) \Big(\prod_{T \in \overline{\mathcal{F}[\mathscr{C},\mathscr{D}]}} \mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(T), \varrho_T}_{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}}(y) \Big) \overline{\mathrm{X}}^{N(\overline{T}), \circledast}_{\hat{\mathfrak{n}}} \\
&\quad \cdot \mathrm{Ker}^{\underline{\mathscr{C}}, \circledast}_{\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}} \overline{\mathrm{X}}^{e_{\mathrm{p}}(\underline{\mathscr{C}}), \circledast}_{\chi \mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}} \Big(\prod_{u \in L_{\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}} \setminus L_{\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}}} \xi_{\mathfrak{t}(u)}(y_u) \Big) \\
&\cdot (-1)^{|\underline{\mathscr{D}}|} \int dy_{\tilde{N}[\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}]} \ddot{\varpi}^{\mathfrak{n}-\hat{\mathfrak{n}}-\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}}_{\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}}[\mathscr{D}, \mathcal{F}](y \sqcup x_{\circledast}).
\end{aligned}$$

Here $\ddot{\varpi}^{\mathfrak{n}-\hat{\mathfrak{n}}-\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}}_{\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}}[\mathscr{D}, \mathcal{F}]$ is built using the second lines of (4.17) and (4.19).

Using our inductive hypothesis for the very last line we see that the expression above is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
&(-1)^{|\mathscr{C}|} \sum_{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}, \mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}, \mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}} \frac{1}{(\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}} + \mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}})!} \binom{\mathfrak{n}}{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}} \mathbb{1}^{\underline{\mathscr{D}}}_{<\gamma}(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}} \mathfrak{e}) \\
&\quad \cdot \Upsilon^{\xi} \Big[(-1)^{|\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}| + |\hat{\mathfrak{n}}|} \overline{T}[\mathscr{C}, \mathscr{D}, \mathcal{F}]^{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}} + \hat{\mathfrak{n}} + \chi(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}} + \mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}})}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{f}} \Big](x_{\circledast}) \\
&\quad \cdot \Upsilon^{\xi} \Big[\mathbf{P}_{\sigma_{\mathscr{D},\mathcal{F}}} \hat{\mathscr{A}}_{+} \overline{T}[\mathscr{D}, \mathcal{F}]^{\mathfrak{n}-\hat{\mathfrak{n}}-\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{D}}, \mathfrak{o}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{D}}} \Big](x_{\circledast}).
\end{aligned}$$

Comparing this with (4.16) we arrive at the desired result. □

4.3 An explicit formula for the BPHZ renormalized tree

In this subsection we put together the results of the previous two subsections and prove the following proposition. For any $\tilde{L} \subset L(\overline{T})$ and $\pi \in \mathcal{P}[L(\overline{T}) \setminus \tilde{L}]$, $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$,

$\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_{\mathscr{C}}$, $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$, we define $\mathcal{W}_L^\pi[\mathcal{F}, \mathscr{C}] \in \mathscr{C}_{\tilde{L} \cup \{\varrho_*, \circledast\}}$ via the following integral formula where we write $y \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\tilde{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T}) \setminus \tilde{L}}$, $x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\tilde{L} \cup \{\varrho_*, \circledast\}}$, and $z = x \sqcup y$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{W}_{\tilde{L}}^\pi[\mathcal{F}, \mathscr{C}](x_{\tilde{L} \cup \{\varrho_*, \circledast\}}) \\
&\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\tilde{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T}) \setminus \tilde{L}} dy \, \mathrm{Cu}_\pi^{L_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})}(z) \cdot \mathrm{Ker}_0^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T}) \setminus \mathscr{C}}(z) \cdot \mathrm{RKer}_0^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T}) \cap \mathscr{C}}(z) \cdot \mathrm{X}_{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}, \circledast}^{\tilde{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})}(z) \\
&\quad \cdot \Big(\prod_{S \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}} H_{\pi, \mathcal{F}, S} \Big[\mathrm{RKer}_0^{K^\downarrow(S) \cap \mathscr{C}} \cdot \mathrm{Ker}_0^{K^\downarrow(S) \setminus \mathscr{C}} \mathrm{X}_{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}, \circledast}^{\tilde{N}(S)} \Big] (z_{N^\downarrow(S)} \sqcup z_{\varrho_S}) \Big) \, .
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.22 *For any $x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\{\circledast, \varrho_*\}}$,*

$$\hat{\Upsilon}^\xi[\overline{T}_{\overline{\mathfrak{e}}}^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}](x) = \sum_{\substack{\tilde{L} \subset L(\overline{T}) \\ \pi \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}[L(\overline{T}) \setminus \tilde{L}] \\ \mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F}_\pi, \, \mathscr{D} \subset \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{G}}}} \int_{\tilde{L} \setminus \{\varrho_*\}} dy \, \mathcal{W}_{\tilde{L}}^\pi[\mathcal{G}, \mathscr{D}](z) \cdot \mathrm{Wick}\big(\{\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(u)}(z_u)\}_{u \in \tilde{L}} \big) \quad (4.20)$$

where $z = x \sqcup y$ and, for any multiset A of random variables, $\mathrm{Wick}(A)$ *denotes the Wick product of the elements of A (see [HS15, Def. 4.5] or [AT06, Appendix B]).*

Proof. Starting from the LHS, we have

$$(\mathrm{id} \otimes \hat{\Delta}_+) \hat{\Delta}_-(\overline{T}, 0)_{\overline{\mathfrak{e}}}^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}^{\le 1} \\ \mathscr{C} \in \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\le 1}}} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{n}_F, \mathfrak{e}_F \\ \mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{C}}, \mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{C}}}} A(\mathcal{F}, \mathscr{C}, \mathfrak{n}_F, \mathfrak{e}_F, \mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{C}}, \mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{C}}) \, , \quad (4.21)$$

where $A(\mathcal{F}, \mathscr{C}, \mathfrak{n}_F, \mathfrak{e}_F, \mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{C}}, \mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{C}})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big(\prod_{S \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{1}_{< \omega(S)}(\mathfrak{n}_S + \mathfrak{e}_S) \Big) \binom{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}{\mathfrak{n}_F} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{e}_F!} (F, 0)_{\overline{\mathfrak{e}}}^{\mathfrak{n}_F + \chi \mathfrak{e}_F, 0} \quad (4.22) \\
&\quad \otimes \binom{\overline{\mathfrak{n}} - \mathfrak{n}_F}{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{C}}} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{C}}!} \mathbb{1}_{< \gamma}^{\mathscr{C}}(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{C}} + \mathfrak{e}_F) (\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}], [F]_1)_{\overline{\mathfrak{e}} + \mathfrak{e}_F}^{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{C}} + \chi \mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{C}}, 0} \\
&\quad \otimes \overline{T}[\mathscr{C}, \mathcal{F}]_{\overline{\mathfrak{e}} + \mathfrak{e}_F + \mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{C}}}^{\mathfrak{n} - \mathfrak{n}_F - \mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{C}}, \mathfrak{o}_F} \, ,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathfrak{o}_F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{n}_F + \chi \mathfrak{e}_F$. Note that we used Lemma 4.17 here. Above, F is the i-forest corresponding to $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}^{\le 1}$, the sum over decorations in (4.21) is a sum over node decorations $\mathfrak{n}_F$ on $N(F) \setminus \varrho(F)$, $\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{C}}$ on $\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}]$, edge decorations $\mathfrak{e}_F$ on $K_{\mathcal{F}}^\partial(\overline{T})$ and $\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{C}}$ on $\mathscr{C}$. The edge decorations $\mathfrak{e}_S$ and node decorations $\mathfrak{n}_S$ appearing in (4.22) are given by the restrictions of $\mathfrak{e}_F$ to $K_T^\partial(\overline{T})$ and $\mathfrak{n}_F$ to $\tilde{N}(T)$, respectively.

Observe that we have

$$\bigsqcup_{\tilde{L} \subset L(\overline{T})} \bigsqcup_{\pi \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}[L(\overline{T}) \setminus \tilde{L}]} \bigsqcup_{\substack{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\pi \\ \mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}}} \{(\mathcal{F}, \mathscr{C}, \pi)\} = \bigsqcup_{\substack{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F} \\ \mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}}} \bigsqcup_{\substack{\pi \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}[L(\mathcal{F})] \\ \pi \text{ comp. } \mathcal{F}}} \bigsqcup_{\bar{\pi} \in \mathcal{P}[\tilde{L} \setminus L(\mathcal{F})]} \{(\mathcal{F}, \mathscr{C}, \pi \sqcup \bar{\pi})\},$$

$$\sum_{\bar\pi\in\mathcal{P}[L_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})]} \mathrm{Cu}_\pi^{L_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})}(y)\mathrm{Wick}\Big(\{\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(u)}(y_u)\}_{u\in L_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})\setminus \mathrm{supp}(\pi)}\Big) = \prod_{u\in L_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})}\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(u)}(y_u),$$

where the second inequality holds for any $\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{F}$. We can use the two identities above to interchange summations and eliminate the Wick monomials on the RHS of (4.20) to see that, again writing $z = y_{\tilde N_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})}\sqcup x_{\{\varrho_*,\circledast\}}$, it is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{F}^{\leq 1}\\ \mathscr{C}\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\leq 1}}}\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{G}\in\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{F}]\\ \mathscr{D}\in\mathfrak{C}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]}}\sum_{\substack{\pi\in\bar{\mathcal{P}}[L(\mathcal{G})]\\ \pi\text{ comp. }\mathcal{G}}}\int_{\tilde N_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})}dy\,\Big(\prod_{u\in L_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})}\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(u)}(z)\Big)\mathrm{X}^{\tilde N_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})}_{\overline{\mathfrak{n}},\circledast}(z) \qquad (4.23)\\ \cdot\,\mathring{\mathrm{Ker}}_0^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})\setminus\mathscr{D}}(z)\cdot\mathring{\mathrm{RKer}}_0^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})\cap\mathscr{D}}(z)\\ \cdot\,\Big(\prod_{S\in\mathcal{F}}H_{\pi,\mathcal{G},S}\Big[\mathrm{RKer}_0^{K^\downarrow(S)\cap\mathscr{D}}\cdot\mathrm{Ker}_0^{K^\downarrow(S)\setminus\mathscr{D}}\mathrm{X}^{\tilde N(S)}_{\overline{\mathfrak{n}},\circledast}(z)\Big](z_{N^\downarrow(S)}\sqcup z_{\varrho_S})\Big)\,.\end{aligned}$$

For the time being we fix $\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{F}^{\leq 1}$, $\mathscr{C}\in\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\leq 1}$, and $\mathscr{D}\in\mathfrak{C}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]$. Then by straightforward computation,

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{G}\in\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{F}]\\ \pi\in\bar{\mathcal{P}}[L(\mathcal{G})]\\ \pi\text{ comp. }\mathcal{G}}}\Big(\prod_{S\in\mathcal{F}}H_{\pi,\mathcal{G},S}\Big[\mathrm{RKer}_0^{K^\downarrow(S)\cap\mathscr{D}}\cdot\mathrm{Ker}_0^{K^\downarrow(S)\setminus\mathscr{D}}\mathrm{X}^{\tilde N(S)}_{\overline{\mathfrak{n}},\circledast}\Big](z)\Big) \qquad (4.24)\\ &=\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{G}\in\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{F}]\\ \pi\in\bar{\mathcal{P}}[L(\mathcal{G})]\\ \pi\text{ comp. }\mathcal{G},}}\sum_{\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}_F}\binom{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}{\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}_F}\mathring{\mathrm{RKer}}_0^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})\cap\mathscr{D}}(z)\\ &\cdot\Big(\prod_{S\in\mathcal{F}}\mathrm{X}^{\tilde N(S),\varrho_S}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}_F,\circledast}(z)H_{\pi,\mathcal{F},S}\Big[\mathrm{RKer}_0^{K^\downarrow(S)\cap\mathscr{D}}\mathrm{Ker}_0^{K^\downarrow(S)\setminus\mathscr{D}}\mathrm{X}^{\tilde N(S)}_{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}-\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}_F}\Big](z)\Big)\\ &=(-1)^{|\mathcal{F}|}\sum_{\substack{\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}_F,\mathfrak{n}_F,\\ \mathfrak{e}_F}}\binom{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}{\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}_F}\Big(\prod_{S\in\mathcal{F}}\mathrm{X}^{\tilde N(S),\varrho_S}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}_F,\circledast}(z)\mathrm{X}^{\tilde N(S),\varrho_S}_{\mathfrak{n}-\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}_F-\mathfrak{n}_F,\circledast}(z)\binom{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}-\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}_F\ \omega(S)}{\mathfrak{n}_S\ \mathfrak{e}_S}\Big)\\ &\cdot\mathrm{RKer}_{\mathfrak{e}_F}^{K^\downarrow(\mathcal{F})\cap\mathscr{D}}(z)\mathrm{Ker}_{\mathfrak{e}_F}^{K^\downarrow(\mathcal{F})\setminus\mathscr{D}}(z)\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{G}\in\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{F}]\\ \pi\in\bar{\mathcal{P}}[L(\mathcal{G})]\\ \pi\text{ comp. }\mathcal{G}}}\int_{N_{\mathcal{G}}(\overline{\mathcal{F}})}dw\delta(w_{\varrho(\mathcal{F})})\mathring{\varpi}_\pi^{\mathfrak{n}_F+\chi_{\mathfrak{e}_F}}[\mathcal{G}](w)\\ &=\sum_{\substack{\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}_F,\mathfrak{n}_F,\\ \mathfrak{e}_F}}\binom{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}{\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}_F}\binom{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}-\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}_F}{\mathfrak{n}_F}\frac{1}{\mathfrak{e}_F!}\Big(\prod_{S\in\mathcal{F}}\mathrm{X}^{\tilde N(S),\varrho_S}_{\mathfrak{n}_F,\circledast}(z)\mathbb{1}_{<\omega(S)}(\mathfrak{n}_S+\mathfrak{e}_S)\Big)\\ &\cdot\mathrm{RKer}_{\mathfrak{e}_F}^{K^\downarrow(\mathcal{F})\cap\mathscr{D}}(z)\mathrm{Ker}_{\mathfrak{e}_F}^{K^\downarrow(\mathcal{F})\setminus\mathscr{D}}(z)\cdot\bar\Upsilon^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\hat{\mathscr{A}}_-(F,0)^{\mathfrak{n}_F+\chi_{\mathfrak{e}_F}}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{e}}}\Big]\,,\end{aligned}$$

where in going to the last line we used Lemmas 4.7 and 4.14. Note that for fixed $\mathfrak{n}_F$, the Chu-Vandermonde identity yields

$$\sum_{\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}_F}\binom{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}{\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}_F}\binom{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}-\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}_F}{\mathfrak{n}_F} = \binom{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}{\mathfrak{n}_F}\,.$$

It follows that (4.23) is equal to

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{F}^{\leq 1}\\ \mathscr{C}\in\mathfrak{C}^{\leq 1}_{\mathcal{F}}\\ \mathscr{D}\in\mathfrak{C}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]}}\sum_{\mathfrak{n}_F,\,\mathfrak{e}_F}\binom{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}{\mathfrak{n}_F}\frac{1}{\mathfrak{e}_F!}\int_{N_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})}\mathrm{Ker}_0^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})\setminus\mathscr{D}}(z)\cdot\mathrm{RKer}_0^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})\cap\mathscr{D}}(z)\cdot\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})}_{\overline{\mathfrak{n}},\circledast}(z)$$
$$\cdot\Big(\prod_{S\in\mathcal{F}}\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(S),\varrho_S}_{\mathfrak{n}-\mathfrak{n}_F,\circledast}(z)\mathbb{1}_{<\omega(S)}(\mathfrak{n}_S+\mathfrak{e}_S)\Big)\cdot\Big(\prod_{u\in L_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})}\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(u)}(z_u)\Big)$$
$$\cdot\,\mathrm{RKer}^{K^{\downarrow}(\mathcal{F})\cap\mathscr{D}}_{\mathfrak{e}_F}(z)\mathrm{Ker}^{K^{\downarrow}(\mathcal{F})\setminus\mathscr{D}}_{\mathfrak{e}_F}(z)\cdot\bar{\Upsilon}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\hat{\mathscr{A}}_-(F,0)^{\mathfrak{n}_F+\chi_{\mathfrak{e}_F}}_{\overline{\mathfrak{e}}}\Big]\,. \tag{4.25}$$

Next we observe that for fixed $\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{F}^{\leq 1}$, $\mathscr{C}\in\mathfrak{C}^{\leq 1}_{\mathcal{F}}$, $\mathfrak{n}_F$, and $\mathfrak{e}_F$ we have

$$\mathrm{RKer}_0^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})\cap\mathscr{C}}\cdot\mathrm{RKer}^{K^{\downarrow}(\mathcal{F})\cap\mathscr{C}}_{\mathfrak{e}_F}$$
$$=(-1)^{|\mathscr{C}|}\sum_{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{C}}}\frac{1}{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{C}}!}\mathrm{X}^{e_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathscr{C})}_{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{C}},\circledast}\Big(\sum_{\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}\in\mathrm{Der}(\mathscr{C},\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{e}_F)}\frac{\mathrm{Ker}^{\circledast,\mathscr{C}}_{\mathfrak{e}+\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{C}}+\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}}}{\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}!}\overline{\mathrm{X}}^{e_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathscr{C}),\circledast}_{\chi_{\mathfrak{f}_{\mathscr{C}}}}\Big)$$

and we also have

$$\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T})}_{\overline{\mathfrak{n}},\circledast}\Big(\prod_{S\in\mathcal{F}}\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(S),\varrho_S}_{\mathfrak{n}-\mathfrak{n}_F,\circledast}\Big)=\sum_{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{C}}}\binom{\mathfrak{n}-\mathfrak{n}_F}{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{C}}}\mathrm{X}^{N_{\mathcal{F}}(\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}])}_{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{C}}}\Big(\prod_{\substack{S\in\mathcal{F}\\ S\leq\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}]}}\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(S),\varrho_S}_{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{C}}}\Big)$$
$$\cdot\,\overline{\mathrm{X}}^{N(\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}]),\circledast}_{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}-\mathfrak{n}_F-\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{C}}}\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]}_{\overline{\mathfrak{n}},\circledast}\Big(\prod_{S\in\mathcal{F}[\mathscr{C}]}\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(S),\varrho_S}_{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}-\mathfrak{n}_F-\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{C}},\circledast}\Big)\,.$$

With these facts in hand one can carefully factorize the integral of (4.25), and then use Lemmas 4.19 and 4.21 to write (4.25) as

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{F}^{\leq 1}\\ \mathscr{C}\in\mathfrak{C}^{\leq 1}_{\mathcal{F}}}}\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{n}_F,\mathfrak{e}_F,\\ \mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{C}},\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{C}}}}\binom{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}{\mathfrak{n}_F}\binom{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}-\mathfrak{n}_F}{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{C}}}\frac{1}{\mathfrak{e}_F!}\frac{1}{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{C}}!}\Big(\prod_{S\in\mathcal{F}}\mathbb{1}_{<\omega(S)}(\mathfrak{n}_S+\mathfrak{e}_S)\Big)$$
$$\cdot\,\mathbb{1}^{\mathscr{C}}_{<\gamma}(\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{C}}+\mathfrak{e}_F)\Upsilon^{\zeta}\Big[(\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}],[F]_1)^{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{C}}+\chi_{\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{C}}},0}_{\overline{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}_F}\Big]$$
$$\cdot\,\Upsilon^{\zeta}\Big[\hat{\mathscr{A}}_+\overline{T}[\mathscr{C},\mathcal{F}]^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}-\mathfrak{n}_F-\mathfrak{n}_{\mathscr{C}},\mathfrak{o}_F}_{\overline{\mathfrak{e}}+\mathfrak{e}_F+\mathfrak{e}_{\mathscr{C}}}\Big]\cdot\bar{\Upsilon}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\hat{\mathscr{A}}_-(F,0)^{\mathfrak{n}_F+\chi_{\mathfrak{e}_F},0}_0\Big].$$

The proof is finished upon observing that the above expression is what one obtains by applying to (4.21) the operator $\bar{\Upsilon}^{\xi}[\cdot]\otimes\Upsilon^{\xi(\omega)}[\cdot]\otimes\Upsilon^{\xi(\omega)}[\cdot]$. □

4.4 From the BPHZ renormalized tree to the BPHZ model

We close this section by describing how our BPHZ renormalized tree corresponds to a BPHZ renormalized model, using freely the notations and terminology of [BHZ16].

Lemma 4.23 *Fix a realization $\xi(\omega) \in \Omega_\infty$. Let $Z^{\xi(\omega)}_{\mathrm{BPHZ}} = (\Pi^{\xi(\omega)}, \Gamma^{\xi(\omega)})$ be the "BPHZ model" which is defined as the restriction to the reduced regularity structure of the model obtained by applying the BPHZ renormalization procedure of [BHZ16, Thm 6.17] to the random model corresponding to the canonical lift of $\xi(\omega)$ on the extended regularity structure. Then, for every $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$, $(\Pi_z \overline{T}^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}})(\cdot)$ and $\hat{\Upsilon}^{\xi}_z[\overline{T}^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}](\cdot)$ as defined in* (3.5) *coincide as random distributions.*

Proof. There is little to prove here other than to describe why the minor differences between our framework and that of [BHZ16] lead to absolutely no difference in the resulting analytic expressions.

The process of going from elements of our "underlined" spaces of identified objects to their appropriate representatives in the corresponding "un-identified" and non-underlined spaces imported from [BHZ16] entails forgetting the identification map, performing a contraction, and possibly replacing a forest product with a tree product. This "forgetting" is denoted by an algebra homomorphism $\mathcal{U} : \langle \underline{\mathfrak{F}_2} \rangle \to \langle \mathfrak{F}_2 \rangle$ given by dropping the identification data from any element in $\underline{\mathfrak{F}_2}$ and then extending by linearity.

As in [BHZ16] we use a variety of contraction maps. We start with a map $\Bbbk : \langle \mathfrak{F}_2 \rangle \to \langle \mathfrak{F}_2 \rangle$ defined exactly as $\mathcal{K}$ is in [BHZ16, Def. 3.14] but with a minor difference in how decorations are treated - in the definition of $\Bbbk$ the new $[\mathfrak{o}]$ label should be replaced by $[\mathfrak{o}]'$ given by

$$[\mathfrak{o}]'(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{y \in x} \mathfrak{o}(y) + \sum_{e \in E_F \cap \hat{F}^{-1}(2) \cap x} (\mathfrak{t}(e) - \mathfrak{e}(e)).$$

We then define, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, maps $\Bbbk_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Bbbk \circ \Phi_i$ and $\widehat{\Bbbk}_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Bbbk \circ \widehat{\Phi}_i$ where $\Phi_i, \widehat{\Phi}_i : \langle \mathfrak{F}_2 \rangle \to \langle \mathfrak{F}_2 \rangle$ are defined by [BHZ16, Eq. 3.22] along with the immediately preceding and following paragraphs.

Finally, we define $\mathcal{O} : \langle \mathfrak{F}_2 \rangle \to \langle \mathfrak{F}_2 \rangle$ to be the map that sets all extended node labels $\mathfrak{o}$ that appear to zero. Then, remembering that $\overline{\mathfrak{n}}(\varrho_*) = 0$, it is straightforward to check that

$$\Big(\mathcal{U} \otimes \Bbbk \mathcal{U} \otimes \widehat{\Bbbk}_2 \mathcal{U}\Big)(\mathrm{Id} \otimes \hat{\Delta}_2)\hat{\Delta}_1(\overline{T}, 0)^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}} = (\mathrm{Id} \otimes \mathcal{O} \otimes \mathrm{Id})(\mathrm{Id} \otimes \Delta_2)\Delta_1 \overline{T}^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}},$$

where we are implicitly using that the RHS can be identified as an element of $\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{ex}}_- \otimes \mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{ex}} \otimes \mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{ex}}_+$.

For the negative twisted antipodes $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_- : \mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{ex}}_- \to \widehat{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathrm{ex}}_-$ it is again straightforward to see that, for every $(F, 0)^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \underline{\mathfrak{F}_0}$ which, (i) can be written as a forest product of elements of $\mathfrak{X}_-$ and (ii) satisfies $\Bbbk_1 \mathcal{U}(F, 0)^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{ex}}_-$, one has the identity

$$\Bbbk_1 \mathcal{U} \hat{\mathcal{A}}_-(F, 0)^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}} = \mathcal{O} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_- \mathcal{U}(F, 0)^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \, .$$

This claim can be verified inductively in $|E_F|$.

We turn to positive twisted antipode - for any i-tree of the form $(\overline{T},\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}}$ with $\widehat{\Bbbk}_2\mathcal{U}(\overline{T},\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{ex}}_+$ one has

$$\mathscr{J}\widehat{\Bbbk}_2\mathcal{U}\hat{\mathcal{A}}_+(\overline{T},\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}} = \mathfrak{O}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}\widehat{\Bbbk}_2\mathcal{U}(\overline{T},\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n},\mathfrak{o}}_{\mathfrak{e}},$$

where $\mathscr{J} : \langle\widehat{\mathfrak{T}}_2\rangle_{\mathrm{for}} \to \langle\widehat{\mathfrak{T}}_2\rangle$ is the operation of joining roots as given in [BHZ16, Def. 4.6] and the equality above is in the sense of elements of $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathrm{ex}}_+$. This claim can be verified inductively in $|E_{\overline{T}} \setminus E_{\overline{T}_{\not\geq[\mathscr{C}]}}|$.

It follows that one has equality

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(\Bbbk_1\mathcal{U}\hat{\mathcal{A}}_- \otimes \Bbbk\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathscr{J}\widehat{\Bbbk}_2\mathcal{U}\hat{\mathcal{A}}_+\Big)(\mathrm{Id}\otimes\hat{\Delta}_2)\hat{\Delta}_1(\overline{T},0)^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \\ = (\mathfrak{O}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_-\otimes\mathfrak{O}\otimes\mathfrak{O}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_+)(\mathrm{Id}\otimes\Delta_2)\Delta_1\overline{T}^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}\end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

as elements of $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathrm{ex}}_-\otimes\mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{ex}}\otimes\widehat{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathrm{ex}}_+$.

If we denote by $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\xi(\cdot)} : \mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{ex}} \to \mathscr{C}^\infty$ the unique multiplicative admissible random map with $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\xi(\omega)}[\Xi_{\mathfrak{t}}] \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \xi_{\mathfrak{t}}(\omega)$ for all $\mathfrak{t}\in\mathfrak{L}_-$ and again write $Z^{\xi(\omega)}_{\mathrm{BPHZ}} = (\Pi^{\xi(\omega)},\Gamma^{\xi(\omega)})$ then for any $x_\otimes, x_{\varrho_*}\in\mathbf{R}^d$ one has

$$\begin{aligned}&(\Pi^{\xi(\omega)}_{x_\otimes}\overline{T}^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}})(x_{\varrho_*}) \\ &= (g^-(\mathbf{\Pi}^{\xi(\cdot)})\otimes\mathbf{\Pi}^{\xi(\omega)}[\cdot](x_{\varrho_*})\otimes g^+_{x_\otimes}(\mathbf{\Pi}^{\xi(\omega)}))(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_-\otimes\mathrm{Id}\otimes\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_+)(\mathrm{Id}\otimes\Delta_2)\Delta_1\overline{T}^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \\ &= (g^-(\mathbf{\Pi}^{\xi(\cdot)})\otimes\mathbf{\Pi}^{\xi(\omega)}[\cdot](x_{\varrho_*})\otimes g^+_{x_\otimes}(\mathbf{\Pi}^{\xi(\omega)}))(\mathfrak{O}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_-\otimes\mathfrak{O}\otimes\mathfrak{O}\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_+)(\mathrm{Id}\otimes\Delta_2)\Delta_1\overline{T}^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

The first equality is by definition, and the second holds because the maps $g^-(\mathbf{\Pi}^{\xi(\cdot)})$, $\mathbf{\Pi}^{\xi(\omega)}[\cdot](x_{\varrho_*})$, and $g^+_{x_\otimes}(\mathbf{\Pi}^{\xi(\omega)})$ all ignore the extended node label.

We then observe the following.

- For any $(\overline{T},\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \underline{\mathfrak{T}_1}$ with $\Bbbk\mathcal{U}(\overline{T},\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}}](x_{\varrho_*}) \in \mathcal{T}^{\mathrm{ex}}$

$$\mathbf{\Pi}^{\xi(\omega)}[\Bbbk\mathcal{U}(\overline{T},\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}}](x_{\varrho_*}) = \Upsilon^{\xi(\omega)}[(\overline{T},\hat{T})^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}}](x_{\varrho_*}).$$

- For any $(F,\hat{F})^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \langle\underline{\widehat{\mathfrak{T}}_2}\rangle_{\mathrm{for}}$ with $\mathscr{J}\widehat{\Bbbk}_2\mathcal{U}(F,\hat{F})^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \widehat{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathrm{ex}}_+$

$$g^+_{x_\otimes}(\mathbf{\Pi}^{\xi(\omega)})\mathscr{J}\widehat{\Bbbk}_2\mathcal{U}(F,\hat{F})^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}} = \Upsilon^{\xi(\omega)}[(F,\hat{F})^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}}](x_\otimes).$$

- For any $(F,\hat{F})^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \underline{\mathfrak{F}_1}$ with $\Bbbk_1\mathcal{U}(F,\hat{F})^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \in \widehat{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathrm{ex}}_-$

$$g^-(\mathbf{\Pi}^{\xi(\cdot)})\Bbbk_1\mathcal{U}(F,\hat{F})^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}} = \bar{\Upsilon}^{\xi}[(F,\hat{F})^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{e}}].$$

Using these identities, it remains to compare (3.5) to (4.27) in order to complete the proof. □

4.5 An example

We have verified that in our setting we have recovered the BPHZ model of [BHZ16]. In fact, the BPHZ model has already appeared in previous works using the framework of regularity structures, but not under that name. In this subsection we compare, for a single symbol, our formulas for the BPHZ model with those of the renormalized model appearing in [HS15]. The symbol we choose to look at is $\mathcal{V}$.

The context here is that of the KPZ equation, we we are working on $\mathbf{R}^2$ with space-time scaling $\mathfrak{s} = (2, 1)$. We have a single kernel type $\mathfrak{k}$ which corresponds to the spatial derivative of the space-time heat kernel on $\mathbf{R}^2$ and a single noise type $\mathfrak{l}$ which corresponds to the driving noise. We specify a homogeneity assignment $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ by setting $|\mathfrak{k}|_{\mathfrak{s}} = 1$ and $|\mathfrak{l}|_{\mathfrak{s}} = -3/2 - \kappa$ where $\kappa \in (0, 1/10)$. We also fixed a random, smooth noise time map given by setting $\xi_\varepsilon = \xi * \varrho_\varepsilon$.

Using the symbolic notation for kernels and integrals of [HQ15] one has

$(\hat{\Pi}^{(\varepsilon)}_{x_\circledast} \mathcal{V})(\varphi^\lambda_{x_\circledast}) =$  (4.28)

We have modified the notations of [HQ15] slightly, the new blue vertex corresponds to the base point $\circledast$ of the model and the green dot now represents the variable for the root of the tree. However all the kernel notation remains exactly the same.

Switching back to our conventions the combinatorial tree T_0^0 corresponding to $\mathcal{V}$ is given by



One has $N(T) = \{u_i\}_{i=1}^3 \sqcup \{v_i\}_{i=1}^4$ with $\varrho_T = u_1$ and $L(T) = \{v_i\}_{i=1}^4$.

We now describe what the RHS of (4.20) looks like in this example. Assuming that we are considering centred Gaussian approximations to space-time white noise, only second order cumulants are non-zero, so that any summand corresponding to a pair $(\tilde{L}, \pi)$ not appearing in the list below does vanish. (In the general case considered in [HS15], one has to keep a few more terms.)

1. $\tilde{L} = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$, $\pi = \emptyset$.
2. $\tilde{L} = \{v_1, v_2\}$, $\pi = \{\{v_3, v_4\}\}$.
3. $\tilde{L} = \{v_3, v_4\}$, $\pi = \{\{v_1, v_2\}\}$.
4. $\tilde{L} = \{v_1, v_4\}$, $\pi = \{\{v_2, v_3\}\} + v_3 \leftrightarrow v_4$.
5. $\tilde{L} = \{v_2, v_3\}$, $\pi = \{\{v_1, v_4\}\} + v_3 \leftrightarrow v_4$.
6. $\tilde{L} = \emptyset$, $\pi = \{\{v_1, v_4\}, \{v_2, v_3\}\} + v_3 \leftrightarrow v_4$.

7. $\tilde{L} = \emptyset$, $\pi = \{\{v_1, v_2\}, \{v_3, v_4\}\}$.

Here, we write $v_3 \leftrightarrow v_4$ to denote the same term with v_3 and v_4 exchanged.

Concerning positive renormalizations, the set $\mathfrak{C}$ contains only a single edge: $\mathfrak{C} = \{(u_1, u_2)\}$. Using the same numbering as above (and ignoring the permuted situations we didn't explicitly write out), we have the following possibilities for $\mathbb{F}_\pi$

1. $\{\emptyset\}$.
2. $\{\emptyset, \{S_1\}\}$.
3. $\{\emptyset, \{S_2\}\}$.
4. $\{\emptyset, \{S_3\}\}$.
5. $\{\emptyset\}$.
6. $\{\emptyset, \{S_3\}, \{T\}, \{S_3, T\}\}$
7. $\{\emptyset, \{S_1\}, \{S_2\}, \{S_1, S_2\}, \{T, S_1, S_2\}, \{S_1, T\}, \{S_2, T\}, \{T\}\}$.

Here the trees S_1, S_2, and S_3 are respectively given by



The sum corresponding to scenario 1 gives the first term in (4.28).

The sum for scenario 2 vanishes for either of two reasons - one is that the renormalization of S_1 is a "Wick"-type renormalization (so the term with S_1 renormalized precisely kills the one without) and a second reason is that the kernel K' in [HQ15] is chosen to annihilates constants.

The sum for scenario 3 gives the second term and third term in (4.28), the third term comes when one chooses $\mathscr{C} = \{(u_1, u_2)\}$ which obstructs the renormalization.

The sums for scenarios 4 and 5 give, respectively, the fourth and fifth terms in (4.28) with the factors 2 coming from the permutation we mentioned.

For the sum in scenario 6 we first note that one has

$$\sum_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\pi} \mathcal{W}^\pi_\emptyset[\mathcal{F}, \emptyset] = \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\pi \\ \mathcal{F} \not\ni T}} (\mathcal{W}^\pi_\emptyset[\mathcal{F}, \emptyset] + \mathcal{W}^\pi_\emptyset[\mathcal{F} \cup \{T\}, \emptyset])$$
$$= \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\pi \\ \mathcal{F} \not\ni T}} (\mathcal{W}^\pi_\emptyset[\mathcal{F}, \emptyset] - \mathcal{W}^\pi_\emptyset[\mathcal{F}, \emptyset]) = 0 \, .$$

This sort of cancellation is quite common when $\tilde{L} = \emptyset$. The rest of the sum in scenario 6 (given by $\mathcal{W}^\pi_\emptyset[\emptyset, \{(u_1, u_2)\}] + \mathcal{W}^\pi_\emptyset[\{S_3\}, \{(u_1, u_2)\}]$) gives the sixth term in (4.28).

Finally, the same arguments used for scenario 2 also lead to the vanishing of the sum in scenario 7.

5 Reorganizing sums

Our main goal moving forward is to obtain, uniform in $\lambda \in (0,1]$, L^{2p} estimates for the random variable $\hat{\Upsilon}^{\xi}[\overline{T}^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}](\psi^{\lambda}_{z})$ for some continuous function ψ as in Theorem 2.20 and $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$. Our main theorem promises estimates uniform in ψ but this comes automatically[10] we fix ψ to be the generator of a wavelet basis, so from now on we treat ψ as fixed. The theorem also gives uniformity in z but this will be automatic from stationarity.

If we define, for $\tilde{L} \subset L(\overline{T})$ and $\pi \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}[L(T)\backslash\tilde{L}]$, the kernels $\mathcal{W}^{\pi}_{\tilde{L},\lambda} \in \mathscr{C}_{\tilde{L}\cup\{\circledast,\varrho_*\}}$ by setting, for each $x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\tilde{L}\cup\{\circledast,\varrho_*\}}$,

$$\mathcal{W}^{\pi}_{\tilde{L},\lambda}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{F}_{\pi}\\ \mathscr{C}\subset\mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}}} \mathcal{W}^{\pi}_{\tilde{L}}[\mathcal{F},\mathscr{C}](x)\cdot\psi^{\lambda}_{x_{\circledast}}(x_{\varrho_*}) \tag{5.1}$$

then the functions $\{\sum_{\pi\in\bar{\mathcal{P}}[L(\overline{T})\backslash\tilde{L}]}\mathcal{W}^{\pi}_{\tilde{L},\lambda}\}_{\tilde{L}\subset L_{\overline{T}}}$ play the role of chaos kernels in a non-Gaussian analogue to the Wiener chaos decomposition for the random variable[11] $\hat{\Upsilon}^{\xi}_{\bar{z}}[\overline{T}^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}](\psi^{\lambda}_{\bar{z}})$. In order to obtain the mentioned L^{2p} estimates we try to get good control over the behavior of the kernels $\mathcal{W}^{\pi}_{L}$ for fixed[12] $\tilde{L} \subset L(\overline{T})$ and $\pi \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}[L(T)\backslash\tilde{L}]$ and so for the rest of the paper we treat both of these parameters as fixed. We also write $\mathcal{W}_{\lambda}[\mathcal{F},\mathscr{C}] \in \mathscr{C}_{\tilde{L}\cup\{\varrho_*,\circledast\}}$ for summand of (4.20) for fixed $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_{\pi}$ and $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}$.

Of course one does not expect to get good control over the LHS of (5.1) by inserting absolute values and controlling each summand on the RHS separately - doing so would prevent us from harvesting any of the numerous cancellations created by our renormalization procedures. Exploiting a renormalization cancellation for an edge $e \in \mathfrak{C}$ or divergent subtree $S \in \mathrm{Div}$ requires us to estimate together

$$\mathcal{W}_{\lambda}[\mathcal{F},\mathscr{C}] \text{ and } \mathcal{W}_{\lambda}[\mathcal{F},\mathscr{C}\sqcup\{e\}]$$
$$\text{or } \mathcal{W}_{\lambda}[\mathcal{F},\mathscr{C}] \text{ and } \mathcal{W}_{\lambda}[\mathcal{F}\sqcup\{S\},\mathscr{C}].$$

In many examples it is impossible to harvest all the renormalizations of $\mathfrak{C}$ and Div simultaneously, this is, in our context, the problem of "overlapping divergences". The solution to this problem is the observation that "overlapping divergences don't overlap in phase space". More concretely we perform a multiscale expansion of the quantities we wish to control and then design an algorithm which tells us which renormalizations to harvest for a fixed *scale assignment* $\mathbf{n}$ as in [HQ15]. This algorithm requires some basic manipulations with partially ordered sets (posets). To make notions clear, we introduce these concepts prematurely, that is before we introduce the multiscale expansion itself. This means that many of the notions of this section will be used in an $\mathbf{n}$-dependent way in the sequel.

[10] See [Hai14, Remark 10.8 and Sec. 3.1].

[11] Being pedantic, this is true upon fixing $x_{\circledast} = \bar{z}$ and then integrating x_{ϱ_*} if $\varrho_* \notin \tilde{L}$.

[12] Applying the triangle inequality to deal with the sum over $\tilde{L}$ and π introduces combinatorial factors that are unimportant in our context.

All posets have a natural notion of "intervals", that is subsets of the poset which are either empty or contain unique minimal and maximal elements along with all elements of the poset that fall between these two extremal elements.

Definition 5.1 Given a poset $\mathbb{A}$, $\mathbb{M} \subset \mathbb{A}$ is said to be an interval of $\mathbb{A}$ if $\mathbb{M}$ is either empty or there exist elements $s(\mathbb{M})$ and $b(\mathbb{M})$ such that

$$\mathbb{M} = \{a \in \mathbb{A} \,:\, s(\mathbb{M}) \leq a \leq b(\mathbb{M})\} \,.$$

For a non-empty interval $\mathbb{M}$ we also use the notation $\mathbb{M} = [s(\mathbb{M}), b(\mathbb{M})]$. If elements of $\mathbb{A}$ happen to be sets themselves, equipped with the partial order given by inclusion (which will always be the case for the intervals we consider), we write $\delta(\mathbb{M}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} b(\mathbb{M}) \setminus s(\mathbb{M})$. As a mnemonic one should think of $s(\cdot)$ and $b(\cdot)$ as standing for "small" and "big", respectively. In what follows we view $\mathbb{F}_\pi$ as a poset by equipping it with the inclusion partial order.

Remark 5.2 If $\mathbb{M}$ is an interval of $\mathbb{F}_\pi$ then for any $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ one has that $\mathbb{M} \cap \mathbb{F}_{\mathscr{C},\pi}$ is an interval of $\mathbb{F}_\pi$.

This is immediate when $\mathbb{M} = \emptyset$ or $\mathbb{M}$ is non-empty and $s(\mathbb{M}) \notin \mathbb{F}_{\mathscr{C},\pi}$, in both situations $\mathbb{M} \cap \mathbb{F}_{\mathscr{C},\pi} = \emptyset$. If $\mathbb{M}$ is non-empty with $s(\mathbb{M}) \in \mathbb{F}_{\mathscr{C},\pi}$, then it is straightforward to check that $\mathbb{M} \cap \mathbb{F}_{\mathscr{C},\pi} = [s(\mathbb{M}), b(\mathbb{M}) \cap \mathrm{Div}_{\mathscr{C}}]$.

For the rest of the paper an *interval of forests* refers to an interval of $\mathbb{F}_\pi$. The intervals of forests of interest to us are specified as pullbacks of certain maps from $\mathbb{F}_\pi$ to itself called forest projections.

Definition 5.3 A map $P : \mathbb{F}_\pi \to \mathbb{F}_\pi$ is said to be a forest projection if for any $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{F}_\pi$, $P^{-1}[\mathcal{S}]$ is either empty or an interval of forests $\mathbb{M}$ with $s(\mathbb{M}) = \mathcal{S}$.

Given $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ and a forest projection P, we sometimes use the shorthand $P_{\mathscr{C}}^{-1}[\cdot] = P^{-1}[\cdot] \cap \mathbb{F}_{\mathscr{C},\pi}$. A simple observation that we use frequently is that

$$\mathscr{C}_1 \subset \mathscr{C}_2 \subset \mathfrak{C} \quad \Rightarrow \quad P_{\mathscr{C}_2}^{-1}[\mathcal{S}] \subset P_{\mathscr{C}_1}^{-1}[\mathcal{S}] \quad \forall\, \mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{F}_\pi \,. \tag{5.2}$$

For the rest of this subsection assume that we have fixed a forest projection P. Given any forest projection P and $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ we define $\mathfrak{M}^P(\mathscr{C}) \subset 2^{\mathbb{F}_\pi}$ via setting

$$\mathfrak{M}^P(\mathscr{C}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{\mathbb{M} \neq \emptyset \,:\, \exists \mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\pi \text{ with } P_{\mathscr{C}}^{-1}[\mathcal{F}] = \mathbb{M}\right\} \,.$$

Conversely, for any forest projection P and any $\mathbb{M} \subset \mathbb{F}_\pi$ we define

$$\mathfrak{C}^P(\mathbb{M}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C} :\; P_{\mathscr{C}}^{-1}[s(\mathbb{M})] = \mathbb{M}\} \,.$$

Clearly $\mathfrak{C}^P(\mathbb{M})$ is empty unless $\mathbb{M}$ is an interval of forests. Then, for any forest projection P one can rewrite the set $\{(\mathcal{F}, \mathscr{C}) \,:\, \mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C} \,\&\, \mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_{\mathscr{C},\pi}\}$ as

$$\bigsqcup_{\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}} \bigsqcup_{\mathbb{M} \in \mathfrak{M}^P(\mathscr{C})} \{(\mathcal{F}, \mathscr{C}) \,:\, \mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{M}\} \;=\; \bigsqcup_{\mathbb{M} \subset \mathbb{F}_\pi} \bigsqcup_{\mathscr{C} \in \mathfrak{C}^P(\mathbb{M})} \{(\mathcal{F}, \mathscr{C}) \,:\, \mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{M}\} \,. \tag{5.3}$$

We use the shorthand $\mathfrak{M}^P \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{\mathscr{C}\subset\mathfrak{C}} \mathfrak{M}^P(\mathscr{C})$. Equipping $2^{\mathfrak{C}}$ with the inclusion partial order, we use the term *interval of cuttings* to refer to an interval of $2^{\mathfrak{C}}$.

Remark 5.4 In this paper the use of the term "interval" will always refer to an interval of the poset $\mathbb{F}_\pi$ or $2^{\mathfrak{C}}$. However, the reader should be cautious since these two posets are themselves collections of subsets of other posets - Div and $\mathfrak{C}$, respectively.

Our maximum and minimum operations are always applied to *collections of elements* of a poset. For example, given an interval of forests $\mathbb{M}$, $\overline{s(\mathbb{M})}$ denotes the collection of maximal subtrees of the forest $s(\mathbb{M})$ - the selection of maximal elements is taking place with respect to the poset structure of Div since $s(\mathbb{M}) \subset$ Div.

Before stating our next level we define, for any interval of forests $\mathbb{M}$,

$$\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{M}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{C} \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{S\in\overline{b(\mathbb{M})}} K(S) \Big).$$

Lemma 5.5 *For any forest projection P and $\mathbb{M} \in \mathfrak{M}^P$ one has $\overline{\mathfrak{C}^P(\mathbb{M})} = \{\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{M}}\}$.*

Proof. First we observe that for any $\mathscr{C} \in \mathfrak{C}^P(\mathbb{M})$ one must have $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{M}}$ since $\mathbb{M} \subset \mathbb{F}_{\mathscr{C},\pi}$. Next we show $\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{M}} \in \mathfrak{C}^P(\mathbb{M})$. Fix some $\mathscr{C} \in \mathfrak{C}^P(\mathbb{M})$ (the latter set is non-empty by assumption) - we have

$$P_{\mathscr{C}}^{-1}[s(\mathbb{M})] = \mathbb{M} \subset P_{\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{M}}}^{-1}[s(\mathbb{M})].$$

The subset relation is a consequence of the facts that $\mathbb{M} \subset P^{-1}[s(\mathbb{M})]$ and $\mathbb{M} \subset \mathbb{F}_{\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{M}},\pi}$. We also have $P_{\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{M}}}^{-1}[s(\mathbb{M})] \subset P_{\mathscr{C}}^{-1}[s(\mathbb{M})] = \mathbb{M}$ by virtue of (5.2). □

When we perform a multiscale expansion, each scale assignment $\mathbf{n}$ will determine a forest projection $P^{\mathbf{n}}$ which will be used to organize the sum over forests of divergent subtrees and a distinguished subset $\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{n}} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ of positive cuts that can be beneficially harvested under that scale assignment.

We now formulate a criterion which will guarantee that conflicts do not arise between negative renormalizations and positive cuts we wish to harvest, that is $P^{\mathbf{n}}$ and $\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{n}}$ do not get in each other's way.

Definition 5.6 Given a forest projection P and a set of cuts $\mathscr{G} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ we say that $\mathscr{G}$ and P are *compatible* if, for all $\mathbb{M} \in \mathfrak{M}^P$, $e \in \mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{M}}$, and $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$, one has

$$\mathscr{C} \cup \{e\} \in \mathfrak{C}^P(\mathbb{M}) \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \mathscr{C} \setminus \{e\} \in \mathfrak{C}^P(\mathbb{M}).$$

For any compatible $\mathscr{G}$ and P we define, for each $\mathbb{M} \in \mathfrak{M}^P$, a collection of intervals of cuttings

$$\mathfrak{G}_{\mathscr{G}}^P(\mathbb{M}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \big\{ [\mathscr{C}, \mathscr{C} \sqcup (\mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{M}})] : \mathscr{C} \in \mathfrak{C}^P(\mathbb{M}),\ \mathscr{C} \cap \mathscr{G} = \emptyset \big\} .$$

With these definitions the following proposition is essentially immediate.

Proposition 5.7 *Given a forest projection P and a compatible $\mathscr{G} \subset \mathfrak{C}$, one has*

$$\bigsqcup_{\mathscr{C}\subset\mathfrak{C}} \bigsqcup_{\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{F}_{\mathscr{C},\pi}} \{(\mathcal{F},\mathscr{C})\} = \bigsqcup_{\mathbb{M}\in\mathfrak{M}^P} \bigsqcup_{\mathbb{G}\in\mathfrak{G}^P_{\mathscr{G}}(\mathbb{M})} \bigsqcup_{\substack{\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{M}\\ \mathscr{C}\in\mathbb{G}}} \{(\mathcal{F},\mathscr{C})\} \; .$$

Proof. It follows from (5.3) that the left hand side is equal to

$$\bigsqcup_{\mathbb{M}\in\mathfrak{M}^P} \bigsqcup_{\mathscr{C}\in\mathfrak{C}^P(\mathbb{M})} \bigsqcup_{\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{M}} \{(\mathcal{F},\mathscr{C})\} \; ,$$

since $\mathfrak{C}^P(\mathbb{M})$ is empty unless $\mathbb{M} \in \mathfrak{M}^P$. The claim then follows from the fact that all subsets in $\mathfrak{G}^P_{\mathscr{G}}(\mathbb{M})$ are disjoint by definition and every $\mathscr{C} \in \mathfrak{C}^P(\mathbb{M})$ has a unique decomposition $\mathscr{C} = \mathscr{D} \sqcup \mathscr{A}$ with $\mathscr{D} \in \mathfrak{C}^P(\mathbb{M})$ and $\mathscr{D} \cap \mathscr{G} = \emptyset$, as well as $\mathscr{A} \subset \mathscr{G} \setminus \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{M}}$. Indeed, simply set $\mathscr{D} = \mathscr{C} \setminus \mathscr{G}$ and $\mathscr{A} = \mathscr{C} \cap \mathscr{G}$: one then has $\mathscr{D} \in \mathfrak{C}^P(\mathbb{M})$ by the compatibility of $\mathscr{G}$ and P. □

6 Multiscale expansion

Given any set A we denote by $A^{(2)}$ the collection of all two element subsets of A.

We also define

$$\mathcal{E}_\pi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigsqcup_{B\in\pi} B^{(2)} \; .$$

When viewed as a set of edges, $\mathcal{E}_\pi$ forms a union of complete graphs with vertex sets given by the true nodes of the blocks of π.

Note that we sometimes view $\mathcal{E}_\pi$ as a collection of ordered pairs $e = (e_{\rm p}, e_{\rm c})$, when doing this, one can always fix an arbitrary ordering for each of the individual elements of $\mathcal{E}_\pi$.

We also define $\mathcal{E}_\circledast \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(\circledast, u) : u \in N(\overline{T})\}$ and

$$\mathcal{E} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K(\overline{T}) \sqcup \mathcal{E}_\pi \sqcup \mathcal{E}_\circledast .$$

For any subtree S of $\overline{T}$ we write $\mathcal{E}_\circledast(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(\circledast, u) : \; u \in N(S)\}$.

We define a *global scale assigment* for $\overline{T}$ under partition π to be a tuple

$$\mathbf{n} = (n_e)_{e\in\mathcal{E}} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}} \; .$$

We fix $\psi : \mathbf{R} \to [0,1]$ to be a smooth function supported on $[3/8, 1]$ and with the property that $\sum_{n\in\mathbf{Z}} \psi(2^n x) = 1$ for $x \neq 0$. We then define another family of functions $\{\Psi^{(k)}\}_{k\in\mathbf{N}}$, $\Psi^{(k)} : \mathbf{R}^d \to [0,1]$ by setting $\Psi^{(k)}(0) = \delta_{k,0}$ and, for $x \neq 0$,

$$\Psi^{(k)}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \sum_{n\le 0} \psi(2^n|x|) & \text{if } k = 0 \\ \psi(2^k|x|) & \text{if } k \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

For any subset $E \subset \mathcal{E}$ and global scale assignment $\mathbf{n}$ we define $\Psi^E_{\mathbf{n}} \in \mathscr{C}_*$, depending on x_v with $v \in e_{\rm c}(E) \sqcup e_{\rm p}(E)$, via

$$\Psi^E_{\mathbf{n}}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{e\in E} \Psi^{(\mathbf{n}_e)}(x_{e_{\rm p}} - x_{e_{\rm c}})$$

where again for any ordered pair e we write $e = (e_{\mathrm{p}}, e_{\mathrm{c}})$.

We now define single scale analogues of some of the functions we introduced earlier, as well as for the functions

$$\widehat{\mathrm{RKer}}^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathfrak{e}} = \prod_{e \in \mathscr{D}} \Big(\mathrm{Ker}^{\{e\}}_{\mathfrak{e}} + \mathrm{RKer}^{\{e\}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \Big). \tag{6.1}$$

For any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}$ we set

$$\mathrm{Ker}^{E}_{\mathfrak{e},\mathbf{n}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Ker}^{E}_{\mathfrak{e}} \cdot \Psi^{E}_{\mathbf{n}}, \qquad \widehat{\mathrm{RKer}}^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathfrak{e},\mathbf{n}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \widehat{\mathrm{RKer}}^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \cdot \Psi^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathbf{n}},$$
$$\mathrm{RKer}^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathfrak{e},\mathbf{n}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{RKer}^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathfrak{e}} \cdot \Psi^{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathbf{n}}, \qquad \mathrm{X}^{N}_{\mathfrak{n},v,\mathbf{n}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{X}^{N}_{\mathfrak{n},v} \cdot \prod_{u \in N} \Psi^{\{(\circledast,u)\}}_{\mathbf{n}},$$

as well as $\psi^{\lambda}_{\mathbf{n}} \in \mathscr{C}_{\{\circledast,\varrho_*\}}$ via $\psi^{\lambda}_{\mathbf{n}}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \psi^{\lambda}_{x_{\circledast}}(x_{\varrho_*}) \cdot \Psi^{\{(\circledast,\varrho_*)\}}_{\mathbf{n}}(x)$.

We now describe our multiscale expansion for cumulants. Our expansion will be more involved for second cumulants. Since we allow $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{L}_-$ to have $|\mathfrak{t}|_{\mathfrak{s}} \in (-\frac{2}{3}|\mathfrak{s}|, -|\mathfrak{s}|)$ this means that if $\|\xi\|_{\mathfrak{c},j}$ only contained information about cumulants away from the diagonal then the quantity $\|\xi\|_{\mathfrak{c},j}$ could not be used to control, for arbitrary $\xi \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_\infty)$, $\delta > 0$, and $\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{t}' \in \mathfrak{L}_-$ with $|\mathfrak{t}|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |\mathfrak{t}'|_{\mathfrak{s}} \le -|\mathfrak{s}|$, the quantity

$$\int_{\substack{y \in \mathbf{R}^d \\ |y|_{\mathfrak{s}} < \delta}} dx \; \mathbf{E}^c[\{\xi_{\mathfrak{t}}(0), \xi_{\mathfrak{t}'}(x)\}].$$

In particular, if we use a brutal multiscale bounds on the above quantity and only use the information on $\|\xi\|_{\mathfrak{c},j}$ given away from the diagonal then by power-counting the above integral will look divergent. However our norm $\|\xi\|_{\mathfrak{c},j}$ includes data on the behavior of the diagonal through (2.9) so there is no real problem here. In order to overcome this in our power-counting analysis, we perform a built-in "fictitious"-renormalization of second cumulants which uses the data from (2.9). For each $B \subset L(\overline{T})$ with $B = \{e^1, e^2\}$ and $|\mathfrak{t}(B)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \le -|\mathfrak{s}|$ we define, by applying the same trick as used in [HQ15, Lem. A.4], a family of functions $\{\widetilde{\mathrm{Cu}}_{B,j}(x_{e^1_{\mathrm{p}}}, x_{e^2_{\mathrm{p}}})\}_{j=0}^{\infty}$ with the property that each $\widetilde{\mathrm{Cu}}_{B,j}(x_{e^1_{\mathrm{p}}}, x_{e^2_{\mathrm{p}}})$ is translation invariant (i.e., expressable as a function of $x_{e^1_{\mathrm{p}}} - x_{e^2_{\mathrm{p}}}$) and furthermore

1. The identity
$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \widetilde{\mathrm{Cu}}_{B,j} = \mathbf{E}^c[\{\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(e^1)}, \xi_{\mathfrak{t}(e^2)}\}]$$
holds in the sense of distributions on $(\mathbf{R}^d)^B$.
2. $\widetilde{\mathrm{Cu}}_{B,j}$ is supported on $(x_{e^1_{\mathrm{p}}}, x_{e^2_{\mathrm{p}}})$ with $2^{-n-2} \le |x_{e^1_{\mathrm{p}}} - x_{e^2_{\mathrm{p}}}| \le 2^{-n}$.
3. One has, uniform in $j \ge 0$ and $x_B \in \mathbf{R}^{2d}$,
$$|\widetilde{\mathrm{Cu}}_{B,j}(x_B)| \lesssim \|\zeta\|_{2,\mathfrak{c}} |x_{e^1_{\mathrm{p}}} - x_{e^2_{\mathrm{p}}}|^{|\mathfrak{t}(B)|_{\mathfrak{s}}} .$$

4. For any polynomial Q on $\mathbf{R}^d$ of $\mathfrak{s}$-degree strictly less than $-|\mathfrak{s}| - |\mathfrak{t}(B)|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and every $j > 0$, one has

$$\int dx\, \widetilde{\mathrm{Cu}}_{B,j}(0,x)Q(x) = 0. \tag{6.2}$$

Remark 6.1 Note that we do *not* impose (6.2) for $j = 0$. Indeed, this would in general be in contradiction with the first item.

For any $B \subset L(\overline{T})$ and any global scale assignment $\mathbf{n}$ we set

$$\mathrm{Cu}_{B,\mathbf{n}}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \widetilde{\mathrm{Cu}}_{B,n_B}(x) & \text{if } |B| = 2 \text{ and } |\mathfrak{t}(B)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq -|\mathfrak{s}| \\ \Psi^{B^{(2)}}_{\mathbf{n}}(x) \cdot \mathbf{E}^c[\{\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(u)}(x_u)\}_{u\in B}] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Finally, for any $L \subset L(\overline{T})$ and global scale assignment $\mathbf{n}$ we set

$$\mathrm{Cu}^L_{\pi,\mathbf{n}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{\substack{B\in\pi,\\ B\subset L}} \mathrm{Cu}_{B,\mathbf{n}}.$$

We define now define operators $H^{\mathbf{n}}_{\pi,\mathbb{M},S} : \mathscr{C}_* \to \mathscr{C}_{\tilde{N}(S)^c}$, where $\mathbb{M}$ is an interval of forests, $S \in b(\mathbb{M})$, and $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}$. This definition is again recursive and for $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}_*$ we set, for any $x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\tilde{N}(S)^c}$,

$$\begin{aligned}[H^{\mathbf{n}}_{\pi,\mathbb{M},S}\varphi](x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\tilde{N}_{b(\mathbb{M})}(S)} dy\, \mathrm{Cu}^{L_{b(\mathbb{M})}(S)}_{\pi,\mathbf{n}}(y) \cdot \mathrm{Ker}^{\mathring{K}_{b(\mathbb{M})}(S)}_{0,\mathbf{n}}(x_{\varrho_S} \sqcup y) \\ \cdot H^{\mathbf{n}}_{\pi,\mathbb{M},C_{b(\mathbb{M})}(S)}\left[\mathrm{Ker}^{K^{\partial}_{b(\mathbb{M})}(S)}_{0,\mathbf{n}} \cdot [\mathscr{Y}^{\#}_{S,\mathbb{M}}\varphi]\right](x \sqcup y)\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathscr{Y}^{\#}_{S,\mathbb{M}}\varphi = \begin{cases} -\mathscr{Y}_S\varphi & \text{if } S \in s(\mathbb{M}) \\ (\mathrm{Id} - \mathscr{Y}_S)\varphi & \text{if } S \in \delta(\mathbb{M}). \end{cases}$$

Recall that the operators $\mathscr{Y}_S$ were introduced in Definition 4.11. The notation $H^{\mathbf{n}}_{\pi,\mathbb{M},C_{b(\mathbb{M})}(S)}$ denotes the composition of the operators $\{H^{\mathbf{n}}_{\pi,\mathbb{M},T}\}_{T\in C_{b(\mathbb{M})}(S)}$. Again, no order needs to be prescribed for this composition because these operators commute - the justification of this claim is the essentially same as that given for the commutation proved in Remark 4.13. The difference here is that some instances of $\mathscr{Y}_S$ are replaced by $(\mathrm{Id} - \mathscr{Y}_S)$ and all the cumulants and kernels are replaced by single slices of their multiscale expansions but these changes make no real difference when checking that these operators commute.

We can now define single slice, partially resummed chaos kernels. For any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}$, any interval of forests $\mathbb{M}$, and any interval of cuttings $\mathbb{G}$ with $b(\mathbb{G}) \subset \mathfrak{C}_{b(\mathbb{M})}$, we define $\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\lambda}[\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G}] \in \mathscr{C}_{\tilde{L}\cup\{\varrho_*,\circledast\}}$ via setting, for each $x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\tilde{L}\cup\{\circledast,\varrho_*\}}$,

$$\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\lambda}[\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G}](x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\tilde{N}_{b(\mathbb{M})}(\overline{T})\setminus(\tilde{L}\cup\{\circledast\})} dy\, \psi^{\lambda}_{\mathbf{n}}(x \sqcup y) \cdot \mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}_{b(\mathbb{M})}(\overline{T})}_{\overline{\mathbf{n}},\circledast,\mathbf{n}}(x \sqcup y) \tag{6.3}$$

$$\cdot \mathrm{Cu}_{\pi,\mathbf{n}}^{L_{b(\mathbb{M})}(S)}(x \sqcup y)\, \mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^{\mathring{K}_{b(\mathbb{M})}(\overline{T})\setminus b(\mathbb{G})}(x \sqcup y)$$
$$\cdot\ \mathrm{RKer}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^{s(\mathbb{G})\setminus K^{\downarrow}(b(\mathbb{M}))}(x \sqcup y)\, \widehat{\mathrm{RKer}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^{\delta(\mathbb{G})\setminus K^{\downarrow}(b(\mathbb{M}))}(x \sqcup y)$$
$$\cdot\Big(\prod_{S\in\overline{b(\mathbb{M})}} H_{\pi,\mathbb{M},S}^{\mathbf{n}}\Big[\mathrm{RKer}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^{s(\mathbb{G})\cap K^{\downarrow}(S)}\, \widehat{\mathrm{RKer}}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^{\delta(\mathbb{G})\cap K^{\downarrow}(S)}\, \mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{n}}^{K^{\downarrow}(S)\setminus b(\mathbb{G})} \mathrm{X}_{\mathfrak{n},\otimes,\mathbf{n}}^{\tilde{N}(S)}\Big](x \sqcup y)\Big)\ .$$

With our definitions the following lemma is easily checked.

Lemma 6.2 *For any $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_{\mathscr{C},\pi}$ one has*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}} \mathcal{W}_{\lambda}^{\mathbf{n}}[\{\mathcal{F}\},\{\mathscr{C}\}] = \mathcal{W}_{\lambda}[\mathcal{F},\mathscr{C}]\,,$$

where for the sum on the infinite side the convergence is in the uniform topology on continuous bounded functions of $x_{\tilde{L}}$.

On the other hand, for fixed $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}$, interval of forests $\mathbb{M}$, and any interval of cuttings $\mathbb{G}$ with $b(\mathbb{G}) \subset \mathfrak{C}_{b(\mathbb{M})}$, one has

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{F}\in\mathbb{M}\\ \mathscr{C}\in\mathbb{G}}} \mathcal{W}_{\lambda}^{\mathbf{n}}[\{\mathcal{F}\},\{\mathscr{C}\}] = \mathcal{W}_{\lambda}^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G}].$$

7 The projection onto safe forests and choosing positive cuts

We now introduce the family of forest projections $\{P^{\mathbf{n}}\}_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}}$ used to organize the sum over forests, these are the "projections onto safe forests" of [FMRS85]. For any subtree S of $\overline{T}$, we define the edge sets

$$K(\pi,S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K(S) \sqcup \{e \in \mathcal{E}_{\pi} :\ e \subset N(S)\}$$
$$K^{\text{ext}}(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{e \in K(\overline{T}) \setminus K(S) :\ e \cap N(S) \neq \emptyset\} \sqcup \mathcal{E}_{\otimes}(S)\ .$$

Heuristically, one determines whether the divergent subtree S needs to be renormalized under slice $\mathbf{n}$ based on the relative values of the quantities

$$\mathrm{int}_{\emptyset}^{\mathbf{n}}(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{n_e :\ e \in K(\pi,S)\} \ \text{ and } \ \mathrm{ext}_{\emptyset}^{\mathbf{n}}(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{n_e :\ e \in K^{\text{ext}}(S)\}\ . \tag{7.1}$$

We describe the general idea in the scenario where S is the only divergent structure. In this scenario one would sum over the scales assignments in the following way: we freeze the value of the scales external to $\mathrm{ext}_{\emptyset}^{\mathbf{n}}(S)$ and perform a sum on scales internal to S, after this is done we sum over the scales external to S.

It is the sum over the scales internal to S where our bounds blow up due to the divergence of S.

In the parlance of [FMRS85], S is *dangerous* for the scale assignment $\mathbf{n}$ if

$$\mathrm{int}_{\emptyset}^{\mathbf{n}}(S) > \mathrm{ext}_{\emptyset}^{\mathbf{n}}(S). \tag{7.2}$$

The contribution of S for a given scale will be of the order $2^{\omega(S)\text{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\emptyset}(S)}$, which means that the our estimates on the sum over internal scales, subject to the constraint (7.2), will diverge. These are the scale assignments for which we need to exploit the cancellation that occurs between the original integral and the counter-term we subtract for S - we need to harvest this negative renormalization.

On the other hand, the sum over internal scales subject to the constraint

$$\text{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\emptyset}(S) \leq \text{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\emptyset}(S) \tag{7.3}$$

is not a problem, since we have an upper bound on our sum. When (7.3) holds [FMRS85] calls S *safe* for the scale assignment $\mathbf{n}$. We get a bound of order $2^{\omega(S)\text{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\emptyset}(S)}$ after performing the sum over scales internal to S. If S is the only divergence, then our estimate on the entire integral, written as a product of exponential factors, will have the scale $\text{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\emptyset}(S)$ multiplied by a negative constant in the exponent - this comes from the fact that any structure larger than S would be power-counting convergent in this scenario. Therefore the sum over $\text{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\emptyset}(S)$ also creates no problem.

Loosely speaking, the issue of overlapping negative renormalizations is clarified by working in this multiscale approach since, for a given scale assignment $\mathbf{n}$, the set of divergent structures which are dangerous for $\mathbf{n}$ form a forest.

We now generalize the discussion above, as well as make it more concrete. When working with forests $\mathcal{F}$ of divergences, the quantities appearing in (7.1) should be replaced by analogues which are computed "mod $\mathcal{F}$", that is they take the renormalizations of $\mathcal{F}$ into consideration with regards to the notions of internal and external. The forest projections $P^{\mathbf{n}}$ we use will map a forest $\mathcal{F}$ to the subset $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{F}$ which consists of all the elements of $\mathcal{F}$ which are safe for $\mathbf{n}$ when the notions of internal and external are taken "mod $\mathcal{F}$". Defining the projection $P^{\mathbf{n}}$ requires us to introduce some notions.

Fix a subtree S and let $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_{\pi}$ be a forest compatible with S. We define the immediate ancestor of S in $\mathcal{F}$ by

$$A_{\mathcal{F}}(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} T & \text{if } \exists T \in \mathcal{F} \text{ with } S \in C_{\mathcal{F}}(T) \\ \overline{T}^* & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\overline{T}^*$ is the directed graph with node set N^* and edge set

$$K(\overline{T}^*) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K(\overline{T}) \sqcup \mathcal{E}_{\circledast} \ .$$

We also define the edge sets

$$\begin{aligned} K(\pi, C_{\mathcal{F}}(S)) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigsqcup_{T \in C_{\mathcal{F}}(S)} K(\pi, T), \\ K_{\mathcal{F}}(\pi, S) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K(\pi, S) \setminus K(\pi, C_{\mathcal{F}}(S)), \\ \text{and } \ K^{\text{ext}}_{\mathcal{F}}(S) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K^{\text{ext}}(S) \cap K(A_{\mathcal{F}}(S)). \end{aligned}$$

The definitions generalizing (7.1) are then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{F}}(S) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{n_e : \ e \in K_{\mathcal{F}}(\pi, S)\} \ , \\ \mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{F}}(S) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{n_e : \ e \in K^{\mathrm{ext}}_{\mathcal{F}}(S)\} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{7.4}$$

We now introduce the forest projections we will use. For each $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}$, we define $P^{\mathbf{n}} : \mathbb{F}_\pi \to \mathbb{F}_\pi$ by

$$P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{S \in \mathcal{F} : \ \mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{F}}(S) \leq \mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{F}}(S)\} \ .$$

We now present the main arguments (Lemma 7.1 and Proposition 7.3) showing that $P^{\mathbf{n}}$ is a forest projection - here we are adapting [FMRS85, Lem. 2.2, 2.3].

Lemma 7.1 *For any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}$, $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\pi$ and $S \in \mathcal{F}$, one has*

$$\mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{F}}(S) = \mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}]}(S), \qquad \mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{F}}(S) = \mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}]}(S).$$

Proof. Since $P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}] \subset \mathcal{F}$ and since both $K_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $K^{\mathrm{ext}}_{\mathcal{F}}$ are decreasing in $\mathcal{F}$, it is immediate that one has

$$\mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{F}}(S) \geq \mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}]}(S), \qquad \mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{F}}(S) \leq \mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}]}(S). \tag{7.5}$$

We start by turning the first inequality of (7.5) into an equality. Fix S and $\mathcal{F}$ and define

$$K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K(\pi, C_{P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}]}(S)) \ , \qquad \tilde{K} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K(\pi, C_{\mathcal{F}}(S)) \ .$$

The claim is non-trivial only if $\tilde{K} \neq K$. It then suffices to show that for any $e \in \tilde{K} \setminus K$ there exists $\tilde{e} \in K(\pi, S) \setminus \tilde{K}$ with $n_{\tilde{e}} \leq n_e$.

Fix such an e. Observe that if $T \in \mathcal{F}$ with $T < S$ and $K(\pi, T) \ni e$ then it must be the case that $T \in \mathcal{F} \setminus P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}]$, moreover there is at least one such tree T. In particular, there is a (unique) sequence of trees $T_1, \ldots, T_{k+1} \in \mathcal{F} \setminus P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}]$, with $k \geq 0$, such that

- T_1 is the minimal element of $\mathcal{F}$ with $e \in K(\pi, T_1)$,
- for $1 \leq j \leq k$ one has $T_{j+1} = A_{\mathcal{F}}(T_j)$, and $T_{k+1} = S$.

By our assumptions, for $1 \leq j \leq k$ we have

$$\mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{F}}(T_j) > \mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{F}}(T_j) \ . \tag{7.6}$$

For each such j, fix a choice of $e_j \in K^{\mathrm{ext}}(T_j) \cap K(T_{j+1})$. Then our desired claim follows by setting $\tilde{e} = e_k$ since this edge belongs to $K(\pi, S) \setminus \tilde{K}$ and (7.6) implies

$$n_e > n_{e_1} > n_{e_2} > \cdots > n_{e_k} \ .$$

We now turn the second inequality of (7.5) into an equality. For this, we start by introducing the shorthand

$$T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A_{\mathcal{F}}(S) \quad \text{ and } \quad \widetilde{T} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A_{P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}]}(S) \ .$$

With this notation, the claim is trivial if $K^{\text{ext}}(S) \cap (K(\tilde{T}) \setminus K(T))$ is empty so we suppose this is not the case. (In particular, this means that $A_{\mathcal{F}}(S) \neq \overline{T}^*$.)

In a way anaolgous to above, it remains to show that for any $e \in K^{\text{ext}}(S) \cap (K(\tilde{T}) \setminus K(T))$, one can find $\tilde{e} \in K^{\text{ext}}(S) \cap K(T)$ with $n_{\tilde{e}} \geq n_e$. Fixing such an e, we define similarly to before the unique sequence of subtrees $T_1, \dots, T_k$ such that

- $T_1 = S$ and, for $1 \leq j \leq k$, $T_{j+1} = A_{\mathcal{F}}(T_j)$.
- T_k is the minimum element of $\mathcal{F}$ with $S \leq T_k$ and $e \in K^{\text{ext}}(T_k) \cap K(A_{\mathcal{F}}(T_k))$.

One then has $T_j \in \mathcal{F} \setminus P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}]$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$ so that, in particular, (7.6) holds. We then set $e_k = e$ and, for each for $1 \leq j < k$, we pick some $e_j \in K^{\text{ext}}(T_j) \cap K(T_{j+1})$ arbitrarily. It then follows again by (7.6) that $n_{e_j} > n_{e_{j+1}}$ so that, by setting $\tilde{e} = e_1$ our claim is proved. □

Corollary 7.2 *For any* $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}$, $P^{\mathbf{n}} \circ P^{\mathbf{n}} = P^{\mathbf{n}}$.

We can now show that $P^{\mathbf{n}}$ is a forest projection.

Proposition 7.3 *For any* $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}$, $P^{\mathbf{n}}$ *is a forest projection.*

Proof. Fix $\mathbf{n}$. By the previous corollary it follows that if for some $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{F}_\pi$ the set $(P^{\mathbf{n}})^{-1}[\mathcal{S}]$ is non-empty then $P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{S}] = \mathcal{S}$. Fix such an $\mathcal{S}$.

Since $P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}] \subset \mathcal{F}$ for every $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\pi$ it follows that $\mathcal{S}$ is the unique minimal element of $(P^{\mathbf{n}})^{-1}[\mathcal{S}]$, so all that is left to show is that this pullback is an interval. Define

$$\mathcal{G} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{T \in \text{Div} : \ \{T\} \cup \mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{F}_\pi \text{ and } \text{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{S}}(T) > \text{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{S}}(T)\} \ . \tag{7.7}$$

Since $P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{S}] = \mathcal{S}$, it follows from the definitions of $P^{\mathbf{n}}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ that $\mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{S} = \emptyset$. We claim that one also had $\mathcal{G} \sqcup \mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{F}_\pi$. For this, it suffices to show that for any $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{G}$ one has $N(S_1)$ and $N(S_2)$ either nested or disjoint.

Suppose on the contrary that these two sets are neither disjoint nor nested, it follows that $N(S_1) \setminus N(S_2)$, $N(S_2) \setminus N(S_1)$, and $N(S_1) \cap N(S_2)$ are all non-empty. In particular, there must be two edges $e_1 = (u_1, v_1)$ and $e_2 = (u_2, v_2)$ with $e_1 \in K(S_1) \cap K^{\text{ext}}(S_2)$ and $e_2 \in K(S_2) \cap K^{\text{ext}}(S_1)$.

Moreover, the condition that S_1, S_2 be compatible with the forest $\mathcal{S}$ implies that $A_{\mathcal{S}}(S_1) = A_{\mathcal{S}}(S_2)$ contains both S_1 and S_2 and that the node set given by the trees in $C_{\mathcal{S}}(S_1)$ does not intersect the node set of S_2, and vice-versa. As a consequence, for $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, $i \neq j$, one has $e_i \in K(A_{\mathcal{S}}(S_j)) \setminus K(\pi, C_{\mathcal{S}}(S_i))$.

Since $\text{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{S}}(S_1) < \text{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{S}}(S_1)$ we must have $n_{e_2} < n_{e_1}$, on the other hand $\text{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{S}}(S_2) < \text{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{S}}(S_2)$ forces the reverse inequality which gives us a contradiction, thus proving our claim that $\mathcal{G} \sqcup \mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{F}_\pi$

We complete the proof by showing that $(P^{\mathbf{n}})^{-1}[\mathcal{S}] = [\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{G} \sqcup \mathcal{S}]$. For this, we first show that for $\mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{F} \subset (\mathcal{G} \sqcup \mathcal{S})$, one has $P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}] = \mathcal{S}$. Observe that $P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}] \subset \mathcal{S}$ since for any $T \in (\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{S}) \subset \mathcal{G}$ one has

$$\text{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{F}}(T) \leq \text{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{S}}(T) < \text{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{S}}(T) \leq \text{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{F}}(T).$$

The middle inequality is a consequence of $T \in \mathcal{G}$ and the outer inequalities are a consequence of $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{F}$.

The fact that one also has $\mathcal{S} \subset P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}]$ follows from the chain of inequalities

$$\mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{F}}(T) = \mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}]}[T] \leq \mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{S}}[T] \leq \mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{S}}[T] \leq \mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}]}[T] = \mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{F}}[T]$$

which hold for arbitrary $T \in \mathcal{S}$. Lemma 7.1 gives the outermost equalities. Working inward, the next two inequalities follow from $P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}] \subset \mathcal{S}$ and the center inequality is a consequence of $P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{S}] = \mathcal{S}$.

All that is left is proving that $\mathcal{G} \sqcup \mathcal{S}$ is the unique maximal element of $(P^{\mathbf{n}})^{-1}[\mathcal{S}]$, namely that if $P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}] = \mathcal{S}$ then $(\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{S}) \subset \mathcal{G}$. For any $T \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{S}$ we have indeed

$$\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{S}}[T] = \mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{F}}[T] < \mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{F}}[T] = \mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathcal{S}}[T]$$

where the outer equalities are given by Lemma 7.1 and the middle inequality follows from assuming $T \in \mathcal{F} \setminus P^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathcal{F}]$. □

We now define a distinguished set of cuts for each $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}$ by setting

$$\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{n}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{e \in \mathfrak{C} : \; n_{(\circledast, e_{\mathrm{p}})} > n_e\} \; .$$

These represent precisely those edges for which there is a cancellation between the term $\mathrm{Ker}^{\{e\}}_{\mathfrak{c}}$ and its Taylor expansion $\mathrm{RKer}^{\{e\}}_{\mathfrak{c}}$ appearing in (6.1). We also introduce the shorthand $\mathfrak{M}^{\mathbf{n}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{M}^{P^{\mathbf{n}}}$, $\mathfrak{G}^{\mathbf{n}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{G}^{P^{\mathbf{n}}}_{\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{n}}}$, and $\mathfrak{C}^{\mathbf{n}}(\cdot) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{C}^{P^{\mathbf{n}}}(\cdot)$. We can now state our final combinatorial result.

Proposition 7.4 *For any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}$ the forest projection $P^{\mathbf{n}}$ is compatible with the set of cuts $\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{n}}$ in the sense of Definition 5.6.*

Proof. Fix $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}$ and $\mathbb{M} \in \mathfrak{M}^{\mathbf{n}}$. To keep notation light, for arbitrary $\mathscr{D} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ we write similarly to before $P^{-1}_{\mathscr{D}}[\cdot]$ to denote $(P^{\mathbf{n}}_{\mathscr{D}})^{-1}[\cdot] \cap \mathbb{F}_{\mathscr{D},\pi}$.

First we prove that for any $e \in \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{M}}$ and any $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$

$$\mathscr{C} \setminus \{e\} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbb{M}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathscr{C} \cup \{e\} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbb{M}) \; .$$

Fix $e \in \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{M}}$ and let $\mathscr{C} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbb{M})$ with $\mathscr{C} \not\ni e$. The fact that $\mathscr{C} \sqcup \{e\} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbb{M})$ follows from the observation that, since $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{M}}$, one has the inclusions

$$P^{-1}_{\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{M}}}[s(\mathbb{M})] \subset P^{-1}_{\mathscr{C} \sqcup \{e\}}[s(\mathbb{M})] \subset P^{-1}_{\mathscr{C}}[s(\mathbb{M})] \; ,$$

where the outermost sets are both equal to $\mathbb{M}$.

We now turn to the proof of the converse statement. Fix $e \in \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{M}}$ and suppose that $\widetilde{\mathscr{C}} \subset \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{M}}$, $\widetilde{\mathscr{C}} \ni e$, and $\widetilde{\mathscr{C}} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbb{M})$. We now additionally assume that $\widetilde{\mathscr{C}} \setminus \{e\} \notin \mathfrak{C}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbb{M})$ and show that this forces $e \notin \mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{n}}$, thus establishing the claim. Our assumptions imply

$$b(P^{-1}_{\widetilde{\mathscr{C}} \setminus \{e\}}[s(\mathbb{M})]) \supsetneq b(P^{-1}_{\widetilde{\mathscr{C}}}[s(\mathbb{M})]).$$

For any element T of the left hand side which is not an element of the right hand side, it must be the case that $e \in K(T)$ and $T \notin s(\mathbb{M})$. It follows that

$$n_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{p}})} \le \mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{n}}_{s(\mathbb{M})}(T) < \mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{n}}_{s(\mathbb{M})}(T) \le n_e,$$

as a consequence of the fact that $T \notin P^{\mathbf{n}}[s(\mathbb{M})]$ and $e \notin K(S)$ for all $S \in s(\mathbb{M})$. It follows that indeed $e \notin \mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{n}}$ as announced. □

8 Summing over scales

8.1 Interchanging the sum over scales and intervals

In Lemma 6.2 we showed, in an abstract sense, how a sum over forests and cuts could be reorganized into a smaller sum over intervals of forests $\mathbb{M}$ and intervals of cuts $\mathbb{G}$. In the previous section this was made more concrete, we specified an algorithm which, given a scale assignment $\mathbf{n}$, specifies a particular forest projection $P^{\mathbf{n}}$ and compatible distinguished set of cuts $\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{n}}$ for which we can apply Lemma 6.2.

We now reorganize our sums again, first summing over pairs $(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{G})$ of intervals of forests and cuttings and then summing over the scale assignments $\mathbf{n}$ which allow a given pair of intervals to arise from from $P^{\mathbf{n}}$ and $\mathscr{O}^{\mathbf{n}}$. To this end we define

$$\mathfrak{R} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big\{ (\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{G}) \in 2^{\mathbb{F}_\pi} \times 2^{2^{\mathfrak{C}}} \,:\, \exists \mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}} \text{ such that } \mathbb{M} \in \mathfrak{M}^{\mathbf{n}} \text{ and } \mathbb{G} \in \mathfrak{G}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbb{M}) \Big\} .$$

and, for any $(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{G}) \in \mathfrak{R}$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1]$, we set

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G},\lambda} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \big\{ \mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}} \,:\, \mathbb{M} \in \mathfrak{M}^{\mathbf{n}},\ \mathbb{G} \in \mathfrak{G}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbb{M}),\ \text{ and } n_{(\circledast,\varrho_*)} \ge \lfloor -\log_2(\lambda) \rfloor \big\} .$$

We then have the following lemma.

Lemma 8.1 *For any $\lambda \in (0, 1]$, one has*

$$\mathcal{W}^\pi_{\tilde{L}} = \sum_{(\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G}) \in \mathfrak{R}} \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G},\lambda}} \mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{n}}_\lambda[\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{G}]$$

where the LHS is defined as in (5.1)*.*

Proof. By Lemma 6.2 and freely interchanging finite sums with infinite ones,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}^\pi_{\tilde{L}} &= \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}_\pi \\ \mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}_{\mathcal{F}}}} \mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{n}}_\lambda[\{\mathcal{F}\}, \{\mathscr{C}\}] = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbb{M} \in \mathfrak{M}^{\mathbf{n}} \\ \mathbb{G} \in \mathfrak{G}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbb{M})}} \mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{n}}_\lambda[\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{G}] \\
&= \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}} \sum_{(\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G}) \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{1}\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \mathbb{M} \in \mathfrak{M}^{\mathbf{n}}, \\ \mathbb{G} \in \mathfrak{G}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbb{M}) \end{array} \right\} \mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{n}}_\lambda[\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{G}] \\
&= \sum_{(\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G}) \in \mathfrak{R}} \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}} \mathbb{1}\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \mathbb{M} \in \mathfrak{M}^{\mathbf{n}}, \\ \mathbb{G} \in \mathfrak{G}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbb{M}) \end{array} \right\} \mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{n}}_\lambda[\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{G}] = \sum_{(\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G}) \in \mathfrak{R}} \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G},\lambda}} \mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{n}}_\lambda[\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{G}].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the constraint that $n_{(\circledast,\varrho_*)} \ge \lfloor -\log_2(\lambda) \rfloor$ comes for free since $\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{n}}_\lambda[\cdot, \cdot]$ vanishes if this is not the case. □

The goal of the subsequent sections is to prove the following theorem.

Proposition 8.2 *For any $(\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G}) \in \mathfrak{R}$, and any $p \in \mathbf{N}$ there exists C_p such that, uniform in $\xi \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_\infty)$ and $x_\circledast \in \mathbf{R}^d$, one has*

$$\mathbf{E}\Big[\Big(\sum_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G},\lambda}} \int_{\tilde{L}\cup\{\varrho_*\}} dx\, \mathcal{W}_\lambda^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G}](x)\,\mathrm{Wick}\big(\{\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(u)}(x_u)\}_{u\in\tilde{L}}\big)\Big)^{2p}\Big] \tag{8.1}$$
$$\leq\; C_p\Big(\prod_{e\in K(\overline{T})} \|K\|_{|\mathfrak{t}(e)|_\mathfrak{s},m}\Big)^{2p} \|\xi\|_{j,\mathfrak{c}}\lambda^{2p\alpha}$$

uniform in $\lambda \in (0,1]$. Here $m \stackrel{def}{=} 2|\mathfrak{s}|\cdot|N(\overline{T})|$, $j \stackrel{def}{=} 2p|L(\overline{T})|$, and $\alpha = |\overline{T}^{\overline{\mathbf{n}}}_{\mathfrak{c}}|_\mathfrak{s}$.

We pick an arbitrary $(\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G}) \in \mathfrak{R}$ and treat it as fixed for the remainder of the paper, writing $\mathcal{W}_\lambda^{\mathbf{n}}$ instead of $\mathcal{W}_\lambda^{\mathbf{n}}[\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G}]$. We also fix the shorthands $\mathcal{S} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} s(\mathbb{M})$, $\mathcal{B} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} b(\mathbb{M})$, $\mathcal{D} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \delta(\mathbb{M})$, $\mathscr{S} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} s(\mathbb{G})$, $\mathscr{B} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} b(\mathbb{G})$, and $\mathscr{D} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \delta(\mathbb{G})$.

8.2 Summing over scales inductively

In order to efficiently prove a theorem that applies for any value of depth($\mathcal{B}$) it is natural to formulate our analytic scheme in a way that operates inductively with respect to this quantity.

To that end we will decompose the single sum over global scale assignments $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G},\lambda}$ into a family of sums which facilitate summing the scales internal to single $T \in \mathcal{B}$ conditioned on the values of relevant external scales (these two sets of quantities being dependent through the requirement that $T \in \mathcal{S}$ or $T \in \mathcal{D}$). In what follows, for any $\tilde{\mathcal{E}} \subset \mathcal{E}$ and $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}$ we write $\mathbf{j}\restriction\mathcal{E}' \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}'}$ for the restriction of $\mathbf{j}$ to the edges in $\mathcal{E}'$.

The most external set of edges is given by

$$\partial\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{B} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K^\partial_\mathcal{B}(\overline{T}) \sqcup \mathring{K}_\mathcal{B}(\overline{T}) \sqcup \Big(\bigsqcup_{\substack{B\subset L_\mathcal{B}(\overline{T})\\ B\in\pi}} B^{(2)}\Big) \sqcup \mathcal{E}_\circledast\ .$$

We now introduce some sets of "partial" scale assignments, writing

$$\partial\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{B},\lambda} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{N}^{\partial\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{B}} :\ \exists \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G},\lambda} \text{ with } \mathbf{j}\restriction\partial\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{B} = \mathbf{k}\}$$

and, for any $S \in \mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{E}' \subset \mathcal{E}$ with $\mathcal{E}' \supset K^{\mathrm{ext}}_\mathcal{B}(S)$, and $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}'}$, setting

$$\mathring{\mathcal{N}}_S(\mathbf{j}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big\{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{N}^{K_\mathcal{B}(\pi,S)} :\ \exists \tilde{\mathbf{j}} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G},\lambda} \text{ with } \tilde{\mathbf{j}}\restriction\mathcal{E}' = \mathbf{j} \text{ and } \tilde{\mathbf{j}}\restriction K_\mathcal{B}(\pi,S) = \mathbf{k}\Big\}\ . \tag{8.2}$$

Note that for every $\mathbf{k} \in \mathring{\mathcal{N}}_S(\mathbf{j})$ one then has

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{int}^\mathbf{k}_\mathcal{B}(S) \leq \mathrm{ext}^\mathbf{j}_\mathcal{B}(S) \qquad &&\text{if } S \in \mathcal{S},\\ &\mathrm{int}^\mathbf{k}_\mathcal{B}(S) > \mathrm{ext}^\mathbf{j}_\mathcal{B}(S) \qquad &&\text{if } S \in \mathcal{D}.\end{aligned}$$

The following lemma verifies that the set of scale assignments $\mathring{\mathcal{N}}_S(\mathbf{j})$ really only depends on $\mathbf{j}$'s values on the edges of of $K^{\mathrm{ext}}_\mathcal{B}(S)$.

Lemma 8.3 *For any $S \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G},\lambda}$ one has*

$$\mathring{\mathcal{N}}_S(\mathbf{j}\restriction K_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{ext}}(S)) = \mathring{\mathcal{N}}_S(\mathbf{j}). \tag{8.3}$$

Proof. Clearly the RHS of (8.3) is contained on the LHS, we now prove the reverse inclusion. Fix $\mathbf{k} \in \mathring{\mathcal{N}}_S(\mathbf{j}\restriction K_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{ext}}(S))$. We are guaranteed the existence of corresponding $\tilde{\mathbf{j}} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G},\lambda}$ with $\tilde{\mathbf{j}}\restriction K_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{ext}}(S) = \mathbf{j}\restriction K_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{ext}}(S)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{j}}\restriction K_{\mathcal{B}}(\pi, S) = \mathbf{k}$. We then define $\hat{\mathbf{j}} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}}$ by setting $\hat{\mathbf{j}} = (\tilde{\mathbf{j}}\restriction K(\pi, S)) \sqcup (\mathbf{j}\restriction \mathcal{E} \setminus K(\pi, S))$. To finish our proof we need to show that $\hat{\mathbf{j}} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G},\lambda}$.

To prove that $\mathbb{M} \in \mathfrak{M}^{\hat{\mathbf{j}}}$ it suffices to show that $P^{\hat{\mathbf{j}}}[\mathcal{B}] = \mathcal{S}$ and that for any $\mathscr{C} \in \mathbb{G}$ and any $T \in \text{Div}_\pi \setminus \mathcal{B}$, which is both compatible with $\mathcal{B}$ and does not contain any edge of $\mathscr{C}$, one has $\text{int}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\hat{\mathbf{j}}}(T) \leq \text{ext}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\hat{\mathbf{j}}}(T)$. These two statements can together be rewritten as the claim that for every $T \in \text{Div}_\pi$ compatible with $\mathcal{B}$ and disjoint from $\mathscr{C}$, one has

$$\begin{cases} \text{int}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\hat{\mathbf{j}}}(T) \leq \text{ext}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\hat{\mathbf{j}}}(T) & \text{if } T \notin \mathcal{D} \\ \text{int}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\hat{\mathbf{j}}}(T) > \text{ext}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\hat{\mathbf{j}}}(T) & \text{if } T \in \mathcal{D}. \end{cases}$$

This claim can be checked in the following four cases: (i) T is disjoint from all elements of $\mathcal{F}$, (ii) T properly contains at least one element of $\mathcal{F}$, (iii) T is properly contained in an element of $\mathcal{F}$, or (iv) T is an element of $\mathcal{F}$.

In the first two cases our claim follows from the fact that both $K_{\mathcal{B}}(\pi, T)$ and $K_{\mathcal{B}}^{\text{ext}}(T)$ consist of edges where $\hat{\mathbf{j}}$ is determined by $\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G},\lambda}$, while for the last two cases it is because $\hat{\mathbf{j}}$ is determined by $\tilde{\mathbf{j}} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G},\lambda}$ on these edges.

It is easy to see that that all edges whose scale assignments are involved determining $\mathscr{G}^{\hat{\mathbf{j}}} \cap \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{M}}$ are edges where $\hat{\mathbf{j}}$ is determined by $\mathbf{j}$, so it follows that $\mathbb{G} \in \mathfrak{G}^{\hat{\mathbf{j}}}(\mathbb{M})$. Finally, we also have $\hat{j}_{(\circledast,\varrho_*)} = j_{(\circledast,\varrho_*)} \geq \lfloor -\log_2(\lambda) \rfloor$. This shows that $\hat{\mathbf{j}} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G},\lambda}$ as desired. □

We immediately have the following corollary.

Corollary 8.4 *For any $F : \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G},\lambda} :\to \mathbf{R}$ one has*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G},\lambda}} F(\mathbf{n}) = \sum_{\mathbf{n}^{(0)} \in A_0} \sum_{\mathbf{n}^{(1)} \in A_1(\mathbf{n}^{(0)})} \cdots \sum_{\mathbf{n}^{(j)} \in A_j(\mathbf{n}^{(j-1)})} F(\mathbf{n}^{(0)} \sqcup \mathbf{n}^{(1)} \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \mathbf{n}^{(j)})$$

where $j \stackrel{def}{=} \text{depth}(\mathcal{B})$, $A_0 \stackrel{def}{=} \partial\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{B},\lambda}$, and for each $1 \leq i \leq j$ we inductively set, for each $\mathbf{n}^{(i-1)} \in A_{i-1}$,

$$A_i \stackrel{def}{=} \bigtimes_{S \in D_i(\mathcal{B})} \mathcal{N}_S(\mathbf{n}^{(i-1)}).$$

Here, we implicitly make the identifications $(\mathbf{k}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{k}_j) \sim \mathbf{k}_1 \sqcup \ldots \sqcup \mathbf{k}_j$ for scale assignments $\mathbf{k}_i$ that involve disjoint sets of edges. We now inductively define a

family of operators $\hat{H}^{\mathbf{j}}_S : \mathscr{C}_* \to \mathscr{C}_*$, where $S \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathcal{E}'}$ with $\mathcal{E}' \supset K^{\mathrm{ext}}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)$ by setting

$$\begin{aligned}[\hat{H}^{\mathbf{j}}_S\varphi](x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathring{\mathcal{N}}_S(\mathbf{j})} \int_{\tilde{N}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)} dy\, \mathrm{Cu}^{L_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}_{\pi,\mathbf{k}}(y)\, \mathrm{Ker}^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}_{0,\mathbf{k}}(y \sqcup x_{\varrho_S}) \\ \times \hat{H}^{\mathbf{k}}_{C_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}\Big[\mathrm{Ker}^{K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}_{0,\mathbf{k}}\,[\mathscr{Y}^{\#}_{S,\mathbb{M}}\varphi]\Big](x_{\tilde{N}(S)^c} \sqcup y)\,,\end{aligned} \tag{8.4}$$

with the base case of the induction given by setting $\hat{H}^{\mathbf{j}}_{\emptyset}$ to be the identity operator. The operators $\hat{H}^{\mathbf{j}}_S$ are partially summed analogues of the operators $H_{\mathbb{M},S}$ which perform the summation of scales inside S but outside $C_{\mathcal{B}}(S)$ (note that this operator contains in its definition all expressions within $\mathcal{W}^{\bullet}_{\lambda}$ which depend on these scales).

We define, for any $\mathbf{j} \in \partial\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{B},\lambda}$, functions $\mathring{\mathcal{W}}^{\mathbf{j}}_{\lambda} \in \mathscr{C}_{\tilde{N}(\overline{\mathcal{B}})^c}$ via

$$\begin{aligned}\mathring{\mathcal{W}}^{\mathbf{j}}_{\lambda} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \psi^{\lambda}_{\mathbf{j}} \cdot \mathrm{Ker}^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{B}}(\overline{T})\setminus\mathscr{B}}_{0,\mathbf{j}} \mathrm{Cu}^{L_{\mathcal{B}}(\overline{T})}_{\pi,\mathbf{n}} \widetilde{\mathrm{RKer}}^{\mathscr{B}\setminus K^{\downarrow}(\mathcal{B})}_{0,\mathbf{j}} \mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}_{\mathcal{B}}(\overline{T})}_{\overline{\mathfrak{n}},\circledast,\mathbf{j}} \\ \cdot \prod_{S\in\overline{\mathcal{B}}} \hat{H}^{\mathbf{j}}_S \Big[\widetilde{\mathrm{RKer}}^{\mathscr{B}\cap K^{\downarrow}(S)}_{0,\mathbf{j}} \mathrm{Ker}^{K^{\downarrow}(S)\setminus\mathscr{B}}_{0,\mathbf{j}} \mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(S)}_{\overline{\mathfrak{n}},\circledast,\mathbf{j}}\Big]\,,\end{aligned} \tag{8.5}$$

where for any $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathbf{j} \in \partial\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{B},\lambda}$ we set

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{RKer}}^{\mathscr{C}}_{0,\mathbf{j}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{RKer}^{\mathscr{C}\cap\mathscr{S}}_{0,\mathbf{j}} \cdot \widehat{\mathrm{RKer}}^{\mathscr{C}\cap\mathscr{D}}_{0,\mathbf{j}}\,.$$

Lemma 8.3 and Corollary 8.4 together give the following lemma.

Lemma 8.5

$$\sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\partial\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{B},\lambda}} \int_{\tilde{N}_{\mathcal{B}}(\overline{T})\setminus\tilde{L}} dy\, \mathring{\mathcal{W}}^{\mathbf{j}}_{\lambda}(x \sqcup y) = \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{M},\mathbb{G},\lambda}} \mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\lambda}(x)\,. \tag{8.6}$$

8.3 Estimates on renormalization

8.3.1 More notational preliminaries

In what follows we will frequently use the generalized Taylor remainder estimate of [Hai14, Prop. A.1]. In view of this, it is natural to define, for any set of multi-indices A and subset $N \subset N^*$, the set of multi-indices

$$\partial_N A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big\{k \in (\mathbf{N}^d)^{N^*} \setminus A : \exists j \in (\mathbf{N}^d)^N \text{ with } \|j\| = 1,\ k - j \in A\Big\}\,.$$

Note that if $N = \{u\}$ we sometimes write $\partial_u A$ instead of $\partial_{\{u\}} A$.

We introduce some useful notation for the renormalization of second cumulants. For any typed set B we set

$$\ell(B) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{1}\{|B| = 2\}(\lceil -|\mathfrak{t}(B)|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{s}|\rceil \vee 0) \text{ and } R(\pi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{B \in \pi :\ \ell(B) > 0\}\,. \tag{8.7}$$

The second cumulants corresponding to $B \in R(\pi)$ will be renormalized in a manner similar to the divergent subtrees - in particular one needs to choose a distinguished vertex for each such B which serves the same rule that ϱ_S does for $S \in \mathrm{Div}$. To that end for each $B \in R(\pi)$ we label the elements of B with either a $+$ or $-$, so for each such B we can write $B = \{(+, B), (-, B)\}$ - this labeling is arbitrary except for one constraint: we require that for every $S \in \mathcal{B}$ and every $B \in L_{\mathcal{B}}(S)$ one has $(+, B) \neq \varrho_S$. One should think of $(-, B)$ as serving as the "root" of B for renormalization.

Moving forward we take these labelling as fixed. We then define, for every $B \in R(\pi)$, an operator $\mathscr{Y}_B : \mathscr{C}_* \to \mathscr{C}_*$ via setting, for each $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}_*$,

$$[\mathscr{Y}_B \varphi](z) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{b \in \mathrm{Der}(B)} (D^b \varphi)(\mathrm{Coll}_B(z))(z_{(+,B)} - z_{(-,B)})^b \,, \tag{8.8}$$

where

$$\mathrm{Coll}_B(z)_u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} z_{(-,B)} & \text{if } u \in B, \\ z_u & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{8.9}$$

and $\mathrm{Der}(B)$ is the set of all multi-indices b supported on $(+, B)$ and satisfying $|b|_{\mathfrak{s}} < \mathfrak{f}(B)$. We also set $\overline{\mathrm{Der}}(B) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Der}(B) \sqcup \partial_{(+,B)}\mathrm{Der}(B)$ and for any subset $A \subset R(\pi)$ we set

$$\overline{\mathrm{Der}}(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \sum_{B \in A} m_B : \; m_B \in \overline{\mathrm{Der}}(B) \} \,. \tag{8.10}$$

Finally, for any $S \in \mathcal{B}$ we define

$$\overline{\mathrm{Der}}(\pi, S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big\{ \sum_{\substack{B \in R(\pi) \\ B \subset L_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}} k_B : \; k_B \in \overline{\mathrm{Der}}(B) \Big\} \,.$$

This finishes our additional notation for renormalizing second cumulants, we now introduce other useful shorthands. We define a map $\mathfrak{h} : K(\overline{T}) \to \mathbf{R}$ by setting

$$\mathfrak{h}(e) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\mathfrak{s}| - |\mathfrak{t}(e)|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |\overline{\mathfrak{e}}(e)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \,. \tag{8.11}$$

The mnemonic here is that $\mathfrak{h}$ stands for homogeneity, the kernel $\mathrm{Ker}_0^{\{e\}}$ blows up like $|x_{e_\mathrm{p}} - x_{e_\mathrm{c}}|^{-\mathfrak{h}(e)}$ as $|x_{e_\mathrm{p}} - x_{e_\mathrm{c}}| \to 0$.

We also introduce notation for various domain constraints. For $z, w \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and $t \in \mathbf{R}$ we write $z \stackrel{t}{\longleftrightarrow} w$ for the condition

$$C^{-1} 2^{-t} \leq |z - w| \leq C 2^{-t} \tag{8.12}$$

write $z \stackrel{t}{\rightsquigarrow} w$ for the condition

$$|z - w| \leq C 2^{-t} \,. \tag{8.13}$$

In both (8.12) and (8.13) one chooses a fixed value $C > 0$ (not dependent on t).

Remark 8.6 Note that from line to line the constant C implicit in the notations (8.12) and (8.13) may change but remains suppressed from the notation.

In particular, when the notations (8.12) and/or (8.13) appear in the assumptions of a lemma or proposition one is allowed to choose any value(s) of C. Any proportionality constant hidden in the notation $\lesssim$ appearing in the conclusion may then depend on the choices of constants C made in the assumption. Moreover, if there is another use of the notations (8.12) and/or (8.13) in the conclusion of the lemma or proposition, then implicit constants for these conditions cannot be chosen arbitrarily, but have to be taken sufficiently large in a way that may depend on the constants chosen for the analogous expression in the assumptions.

In the end, all of these constants influence the overall factor $C_{\tau,p}$ appearing in (2.20).

8.3.2 Inductive estimates for negative renormalizations

After renormalizing everything in $\mathcal{F}$, the sets $\tilde{N}(\mathcal{F})^c$ and $\tilde{N}(\mathcal{F})$ are the sets of free and integrated out variables of our integrand, respectively. Since the forest $\mathcal{B}$ is now fixed once and for all, we also write $\mathrm{int}^\bullet$ and $\mathrm{ext}^\bullet$ instead of $\mathrm{int}^\bullet_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\mathrm{ext}^\bullet_{\mathcal{B}}$ and, for any $T \in \mathrm{Div}$, we define $\bar{\omega}(T) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lfloor \omega(T) \rfloor < \omega(T)$.

The goal in this subsection is to estimate, for any forest $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{B}$ of depth 1 and any scale assignment $\mathbf{j} = (\mathbf{j}_S)_{S \in \mathcal{F}}$ with $\mathbf{j}_S \in \mathbf{N}^{K^{\mathrm{ext}}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}$, quantities of the form $\hat{H}^{\mathbf{j}}_{\mathcal{F}}(\varphi)$. In order to facilitate this, we define a family of seminorms $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F},\mathbf{j}}$ on the functions of $\mathscr{C}_*$. These seminorms control the derivatives of φ that are generated when one renormalizes the trees $\mathcal{F}$, as well as the derivatives generated by the renormalization of the sub-divergences within these trees. To that end, for any forest $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{B}$ of depth 1, we define

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{Der}}(\mathcal{F}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big\{ \sum_{S \in \mathcal{G}} k_S + \sum_{\substack{B \in R(\pi),\ B \subset L(\mathcal{F}) \\ B \not\subset L(\mathcal{G})}} k_B : \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{B} \text{ with } \mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F}_{\leq}[\mathcal{F}] \\ k_S \in \overline{\mathrm{Der}}(S),\ k_B \in \overline{\mathrm{Der}}(B) \end{array} \Big\}, \tag{8.14}$$

where $\mathbb{F}_{\leq}[\mathcal{F}]$ is defined as in (4.2) and for any tree in $T \in \mathrm{Div}$, we set

$$\overline{\mathrm{Der}}(T) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Der}(T) \cup \partial_{\tilde{N}(T)} \mathrm{Der}(T)$$

where the notation $\mathrm{Der}(T)$ was introduced in Definition 4.11.

The control over derivatives will be modulated by a certain scaling. For $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathbf{j}$ as before and $b \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Der}}(\mathcal{F})$ we define a differential operator with constant coefficients on $\mathscr{C}_*$ by writing

$$\mathbb{D}^{b,\mathbf{j}}_{\mathcal{F}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{S \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{D^{b_S}}{2^{\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)|b_S|_{\mathfrak{s}}}},$$

where we use the fact that each such b admits a unique decomposition $b = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{F}} b_S$ with b_S supported on $\tilde{N}(S)$. Additionally, we build a seminorm which controls the result of acting on a test function φ with the renormalisation operator $\hat{H}^{\mathbf{j}}_{\mathcal{F}}$. This is

achieved by taking suitable suprema of φ and some of its partial derivatives over the variables to be integrated. Recall that $\varrho(\mathcal{F}) \subset \tilde{N}(\mathcal{F})^c$ denotes the set of roots of $\mathcal{F}$. Then, for any $\mathcal{E} \supset \varrho(\mathcal{F})$ and any fixed $x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\mathcal{E}}$ and $\mathbf{j} = (\mathbf{j}_S)_{S \in \mathcal{F}}$ with $\mathbf{j}_S \in \mathbf{N}^{K^{\mathrm{ext}}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}$, we define $\mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbf{j}, x)$ to be the set of all $y \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\tilde{N}(\mathcal{F})}$ such that the following conditions hold

- For each $S \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{S}$, one has $y_v = x_{\varrho_S}$ for all nodes $v \in \tilde{N}(S)$.
- For each $S \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{D}$, one has $y_v \overset{\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)}{\leftrightsquigarrow} x_{\varrho_S}$ for all nodes $v \in \tilde{N}(S)$.

In other words, we restrict ourselves to coordinates y for which "safe" trees are collapsed to a point, while "unsafe" trees are restricted to be of diameter of order $2^{-\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)}$. We can now define the previously mentioned seminorms.

Definition 8.7 Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{B}$ be of depth 1. Let $\mathbf{j} = (\mathbf{j}_S)_{S \in \mathcal{F}}$ with $\mathbf{j}_S \in \partial \mathcal{N}_S$. For $x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\tilde{N}(\mathcal{F})^c}$, we define a family of seminorms $\| \cdot \|_{\mathcal{F},\mathbf{j}}(x)$ on $\mathscr{C}_*$ by

$$\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{F},\mathbf{j}}(x) \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sup \left\{ \left| \left(\mathbb{D}^{b,\mathbf{j}}_{\mathcal{F}} \varphi \right)(x \sqcup y) \right| : \begin{array}{c} b \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Der}}(\mathcal{F}) \text{ and} \\ y \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbf{j}, x) \end{array} \right\} .$$

In the particular case when $\mathcal{F} = \{S\}$ (i.e. it only consists of a single tree), we also write $\|\varphi\|_{S,\mathbf{j}}(x)$ instead of $\|\varphi\|_{\{S\},\mathbf{j}}(x)$.

We then have the following lemmas.

Lemma 8.8 *Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{B}$ be of depth 1. Then uniform in $\mathbf{j} = (\mathbf{j}_S)_{S \in \mathcal{F}}$ with $\mathbf{j}_S \in \mathbf{N}^{K^{\mathrm{ext}}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}$, $x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\tilde{N}(\mathcal{F})^c}$, and $f, g \in \mathscr{C}_*$, one has*

$$\|fg\|_{\mathcal{F},\mathbf{j}}(x) \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{F},\mathbf{j}}(x)\, \|g\|_{\mathcal{F},\mathbf{j}}(x)$$

Furthermore, if $g \in \mathscr{C}_{\tilde{N}(\mathcal{F})^c}$ then $\|fg\|_{\mathcal{F},\mathbf{j}}(x) = \|f\|_{\mathcal{F},\mathbf{j}}(x)\, g(x)$.

Proof. The first claim follows from Leibniz's Rule and the second is immediate from the definitions. □

We use a shorthand for the kernel norms of (2.5) by writing, for any subset of edges $E \subset K(\overline{T})$,

$$\|E\|_{\mathfrak{t}} \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \prod_{e \in E} \|K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}\|_{|\mathfrak{t}(e)|_{\mathfrak{s}}, 2|\mathfrak{s}|N(\overline{T})} .$$

Lemma 8.9 *Let $S \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{F} \overset{def}{=} C_{\mathcal{B}}(S) \neq \emptyset$. Then uniform in $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{N}^{K^{\mathrm{ext}}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}$, $\mathbf{k} \in \mathring{\mathcal{N}}_S(\mathbf{j})$, $x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\tilde{N}(\mathcal{F})^c}$, and any multi-index p supported on $e_{\mathrm{c}}[K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)]$ with $|p(u)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq |\mathfrak{s}|$ for every u in that node set, one has*

$$\left\| D^p \mathrm{Ker}^{K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}_{0,\mathbf{k}} \right\|_{\mathcal{F},\mathbf{k}}(x) \lesssim \|K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)\|_{\mathfrak{t}} \cdot \prod_{e \in K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)} 2^{(\mathfrak{h}(e) + |p(e_{\mathrm{c}})|_{\mathfrak{s}}) k_e} . \tag{8.15}$$

Furthermore, the left hand side vanishes unless, for all $T \in \mathcal{F}$ and $e \in K^{\partial}_T(S)$, one has $x_{e_{\mathrm{c}}} \overset{k_e}{\longleftrightarrow} x_{\varrho_T}$.

Proof. Using Lemma 8.8 it suffices to show that for each $T \in \mathcal{F}$, $e \in K_T^\partial(S)$

$$\|D^{p'}\mathrm{Ker}_{\mathfrak{c},\mathbf{k}}^{\{e\}}\|_{T,\mathbf{k}}(x) \lesssim \mathbb{1}\{x_{e_\mathrm{c}} \overset{k_e}{\longleftrightarrow} x_{\varrho_T}\}\|K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}\|_{\mathfrak{t}(e)} 2^{(\mathfrak{h}(e)+|p'|_\mathfrak{s}+|j(e_\mathrm{c})|_\mathfrak{s})k_e} \,, \quad (8.16)$$

where the multi-index p' is supported on e_c and is bounded as in the assumption. By definition, we have

$$\|D^{p'}\mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{\{e\}}\|_{T,\mathbf{k}}(x) = \sup_{\substack{b\in\widetilde{\mathrm{Der}}(\{T\})\\ y\in\mathrm{Dom}(\{T\},\mathbf{k},x)}} 2^{-|b|_\mathfrak{s}\mathrm{ext}^\mathbf{k}(T)}|(D^{b+p'}\mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{\{e\}})(x_{e_\mathrm{c}} \sqcup y_{e_\mathrm{p}})| \,. \quad (8.17)$$

Note now that the bound $\mathrm{ext}^\mathbf{k}(T) \geq k_e$ holds by the definition of $\mathrm{ext}^\mathbf{k}(T)$ and the fact that $e \in K_T^\partial(S) \subset K_\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{ext}}(T)$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}|D^{b+p'}\mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{\{e\}}(\cdot)| &\lesssim 2^{(|b|_\mathfrak{s}+|p'|_\mathfrak{s}+\mathfrak{h}(e))k_e}\|K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}\|_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}\\ &\leq 2^{(|p'|_\mathfrak{s}+\mathfrak{h}(e))k_e+|b|_\mathfrak{s}\mathrm{ext}^\mathbf{k}(T)}\|K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}\|_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}\end{aligned}$$

yielding

$$\|\mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{\{e\}}\|_{T,\mathbf{k}}(x) \lesssim 2^{(\mathfrak{h}(e)+|p'|_\mathfrak{s})k_e}\|K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}\|_{\mathfrak{t}(e)} \,.$$

It remains to show that all points x in the support of the left hand side of (8.15) satisfy $x_{e_\mathrm{c}} \overset{k_e}{\longleftrightarrow} x_{\varrho_T}$. The support property of $\mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{\{e\}}$ enforces $x_{e_\mathrm{c}} \overset{k_e}{\longleftrightarrow} y_{e_\mathrm{p}}$ for all y's over which the supremum in our seminorm is taken. On the other hand the condition $y \in \mathrm{Dom}(\{T\},\mathbf{k},x)$ forces $y_{e_\mathrm{p}} \overset{\mathrm{ext}^\mathbf{k}(T)}{\leftsquigarrow} x_{\varrho_T}$, so that the required relation follows from the triangle inequality, thus completing the proof. □

Lemma 8.10 *Let $S \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\mathcal{F} \overset{def}{=} C_\mathcal{B}(S) \neq \emptyset$. Then, uniform in $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{N}^{K_\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{ext}}(S)}$, $\mathbf{k} \in \mathring{\mathcal{N}}_S(\mathbf{j})$, $m \in \mathrm{Der}(\pi,S)$, and $x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\tilde{N}(\mathcal{F})^c}$ satisfying the constraints*

$$\begin{aligned}x_{e_\mathrm{p}} &\overset{k_e}{\leftsquigarrow} x_{e_\mathrm{c}} \text{ for all } e \in \mathring{K}_\mathcal{B}(S),\\ x_{e_\mathrm{c}} &\overset{k_e}{\leftsquigarrow} x_{\varrho_T} \text{ for all } T \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } e \in K_T^\partial(S),\end{aligned} \quad (8.18)$$

one has the bound

$$\|D^m\mathscr{Y}_{\mathbb{M},S}^\#\varphi\|_{\mathcal{F},\mathbf{k}}(x) \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{S,\mathbf{j}}(x_{\tilde{N}(S)^c}) \cdot 2^{\bar{\omega}^\#(S)[\mathrm{ext}^\mathbf{j}(S)-\mathrm{int}^\mathbf{k}(S)]+|m|_\mathfrak{s}\mathrm{int}^\mathbf{k}(S)} \,,$$

where

$$\bar{\omega}^\#(S) \overset{def}{=} \begin{cases}\bar{\omega}(S) & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{S},\\ \bar{\omega}(S)+1 & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{D} \,.\end{cases} \quad (8.19)$$

Proof. We fix $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{N}^{K_\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{ext}}(S)}$ and $\mathbf{k} \in \mathring{\mathcal{N}}_S(\mathbf{j})$. Throughout the proof we implicitly assume that x satisfies the constraints (8.18).

We first establish the desired bound when $S \in \mathcal{S}$. A term by term estimate gives

$$\|D^m\mathscr{Y}_S\varphi\|_{\mathcal{F},\mathbf{k}}(x) \lesssim \max_{p+m\in\mathrm{Der}(S)} \Big[\|\mathrm{X}_{p,\varrho_S}^{\tilde{N}(S)}\|_{\mathcal{F},\mathbf{k}}(x)\cdot|(D^{p+m}\varphi)(\mathrm{Coll}_S(x))|\Big] \,. \quad (8.20)$$

Here, the factor $(D^{p+m}\varphi)(\mathrm{Coll}_S(x))$ could be pulled out of the seminorm because it does not depend on any of the variables in $\tilde{N}(\mathcal{F})$.

It is easy to see that we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(S)}_{p,\varrho S}\|_{\mathcal{F},\mathbf{k}}(x) &= \sup\left\{ |\mathbb{D}^{b,\mathbf{k}}_{\mathcal{F}}\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(S)}_{p,\varrho S}|(x \sqcup y) : \begin{array}{c} b \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Der}}(\mathcal{F}),\ b \le p \\ y \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{F},\mathbf{k},x)\end{array} \right\} \\ &\lesssim 2^{-|p|_{\mathfrak{s}}\mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{k}}(S)}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Here we used that our condition on x forces the distances between coordinates in $N_{\mathcal{F}}(S)$ to be at most of order $2^{-\mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{k}}(S)}$, while the constraint $y \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{F},\mathbf{k},x)$ forces the distances between coordinates in N_T for each $T \in \mathcal{F}$ to be of order at most $2^{-\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{k}}(T)}$. Furthermore, for any $T \in \mathcal{F}$ we have

$$\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{k}}(T) \ge \mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{k}}(S). \tag{8.21}$$

Inserting this into (8.20) we have, for $x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\tilde{N}(S)^c}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|D^m\mathscr{Y}_S\varphi\|_{\mathcal{F},\mathbf{k}}(x) &\lesssim \max\left\{2^{-|p|_{\mathfrak{s}}\mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{k}}(S)}|(D^{p+m}\varphi)(\mathrm{Coll}_S(x))| :\ p+m \in \mathrm{Der}(S)\right\} \\ &= \max\left\{2^{|p|_{\mathfrak{s}}(\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)-\mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{k}}(S))+|m|_{\mathfrak{s}}\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)} :\ p+m \in \mathrm{Der}(S)\right\}\cdot\|\varphi\|_{S,\mathbf{j}}(x) \\ &= 2^{(\bar{\omega}(S)-|m|_{\mathfrak{s}})(\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)-\mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{k}}(S))+|m|_{\mathfrak{s}}\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)}\cdot\|\varphi\|_{S,\mathbf{j}}(x)\,,\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used the fact that $S \in \mathcal{S}$ implies that $\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S) \ge \mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{k}}(S)$.

We turn to case $S \in \mathcal{D}$ and start with the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}&\|D^m(1-\mathscr{Y}_S)\varphi\|_{\mathcal{F},\mathbf{k}}(x) \\ &\le \sup\left\{2^{-|b|_{\mathfrak{s}}\mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{k}}(S)}\Big|D^{b+m}[(1-\mathscr{Y}_S)\varphi](x\sqcup y)\Big| :\ \begin{array}{c} b \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Der}}(\mathcal{F}) \\ y \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{F},\mathbf{k},x)\end{array}\right\},\end{aligned}$$

where we have an inequality because we used (8.21). We treat the cases $|b+m|_{\mathfrak{s}} > \bar{\omega}(S)$ and $|b+m|_{\mathfrak{s}} \le \bar{\omega}(S)$ separately. In the former case one has $D^{b+m}\mathscr{Y}_S\varphi = 0$ and we arrive at the bound

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup\left\{2^{-|b|_{\mathfrak{s}}\mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{k}}(S)}|(D^{b+m}\varphi)(y\sqcup x)| :\ \begin{array}{c} b \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Der}}(\mathcal{F}),\ |b+m|_{\mathfrak{s}} > \bar{\omega}(S) \\ y \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{F},\mathbf{k},x)\end{array}\right\} \\ &\le \max\left\{2^{|b|_{\mathfrak{s}}[\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)-\mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{k}}(S)]+|m|_{\mathfrak{s}}\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)} :\ \begin{array}{c} b \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Der}}(\mathcal{F})\,, \\ |b+m|_{\mathfrak{s}} > \bar{\omega}(S)\end{array}\right\}\cdot\|\varphi\|_{S,\mathbf{j}}(x) \\ &\le 2^{(\bar{\omega}(S)+1-|m|_{\mathfrak{s}})[\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)-\mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{k}}(S)]+|m|_{\mathfrak{s}}\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)}\cdot\|\varphi\|_{S,\mathbf{j}}(x)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{8.22}$$

To obtain the first inequality of (8.22) observe that the condition $y \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{F},\mathbf{k},x)$ implies that one also has

$$x_{\tilde{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(S)} \sqcup y \in \mathrm{Dom}(\{S\},\mathbf{j},x). \tag{8.23}$$

For the second equality we used $\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S) < \mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{k}}(S)$.

We now treat the case of $b \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Der}}(\mathcal{F})$ with $|b+m|_{\mathfrak{s}} \le \bar\omega(S)$ and write $D^{b+m}(1-\mathscr{Y}_S)\varphi(x)$ as

$$D^{b+m}\varphi(x) - \sum_{\substack{p,\\ p+m\in\mathrm{Der}(S)}} \frac{(x-\mathrm{Coll}_S(x))^p}{p!}(D^{b+p+m}\varphi)(\mathrm{Coll}_S(x)) \,. \tag{8.24}$$

Viewing (8.24) as a Taylor remainder of order $\bar\omega(S) - |b|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |m|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ for $D^{b+m}\varphi$, we can apply [Hai14, Prop. A.1] followed by (8.23) to get the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\sup\Big\{2^{-|b|_{\mathfrak{s}}\mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{k}}(S)}\Big|D^b[(1-\mathscr{Y}_S)\varphi](y\sqcup x)\Big| : \begin{array}{c} b\in\widetilde{\mathrm{Der}}(\mathcal{F}),\ |b+m|_{\mathfrak{s}}\le\bar\omega(S)\\ y\in\mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{F},\mathbf{k},x)\end{array}\Big\}\\ \le 2^{(\bar\omega(S)+1-|m|_{\mathfrak{s}})[\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)-\mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{k}}(S)]+|m|_{\mathfrak{s}}\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)}\cdot\|\varphi\|_{S,\mathbf{j}}(x)\,.\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (8.22) yields the required bound in the case $S \in \mathcal{D}$ and thus concludes the proof. □

We now state and prove the advertised bound on the operators $\hat H^{\mathbf{j}}_{\mathcal{F}}$ which was the motivation for the introduction of these seminorms.

Lemma 8.11 *Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{B}$ be of depth 1. Then, uniform in $x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\tilde N(\mathcal{F})^c}$, $\mathbf{j} = (\mathbf{j}_S)_{S\in\mathcal{F}}$ with $\mathbf{j}_S \in \mathbf{N}^{K^{\mathrm{ext}}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}$, and $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}_*$, one has the bound*

$$\Big|\hat H^{\mathbf{j}}_{\mathcal{F}}[\varphi](x)\Big| \lesssim \Big(\prod_{S\in\mathcal{F}} 2^{\omega(S)\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)}\|K(S)\|_{\mathfrak{t}}\cdot\|\xi\|_{|L(S)|,\mathfrak{c}}\Big)\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{F},\mathbf{j}}(x)\,. \tag{8.25}$$

Proof. Our proof uses two nested inductions. The outer one, which is also the less trivial one, is an induction in the quantity

$$\mathrm{depth}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{F}) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{depth}[\mathcal{F}\sqcup\{T\in\mathcal{B}:\ \exists S\in\mathcal{F}\text{ with }T<S\}]\,. \tag{8.26}$$

The second, simpler, induction step is then in the cardinality of $\mathcal{F}$ for a fixed value of $\mathrm{depth}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{F})$. For both inductions we only present the inductive steps, the base case being strictly easier to verify.

Fix $m \ge 1$ and assume that (8.25) has already been proven for all forests $\mathcal{G}$ of depth 1 with $\mathrm{depth}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{G}) \le m$. Our aim is to then prove (8.25) for any $\mathcal{F}$ of cardinality one, i.e. for $\mathcal{F} = \{S\} \subset \mathcal{B}$ with $\mathrm{depth}_{\mathcal{B}}(\{S\}) = m+1$.

Fix $\mathbf{j} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathbf{j}_S \in \mathbf{N}^{K^{\mathrm{ext}}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}$, our concern to control the corresponding sum over $\mathbf{k} \in \mathring{\mathcal{N}}_S(\mathbf{j})$ appearing in the definition of $\hat H^{\mathbf{j}}_S$ (see (8.4)). We will use Lemmas 8.8, 8.9, 8.10 and then appeal to Theorem A.10 to control the integral over $\tilde N_{\mathcal{B}}(S)$, the application of this theorem will occur with $x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{N(S)^c}$ fixed but our our estimates will be uniform in x (however dependence on x may sometimes be suppressed from the notation).

The graph underlying our application of Theorem A.10 is given by the quotient graph $K_{\mathcal{B}}(\pi, S)$ where, for each $T \in C_{\mathcal{B}}(S)$, one performs a contraction and identifies the collection of vertices $N(T)$ as single equivalence class of points.

It is convenient to choose the root ϱ_T as the canonical representative of such an equivalence class. Then our set of vertices is given by $\mathcal{V} = N_{\mathcal{B}}(S)$ with $\mathcal{V}_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{N}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)$ (so ϱ_S serves the role of the pinned vertex) and our graph $\mathbf{G}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{G} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathring{K}_{\mathcal{B}}(S) \sqcup \Big\{ \{u, \varrho_T\} : T \in C_{\mathcal{B}}(S),\ u \in e_{\mathrm{c}}[K_T^{\partial}(S)] \Big\} \sqcup \mathbf{C} ,$$

where we view $\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{B}}(S) \subset \mathcal{V}^{(2)}$ as a set of undirected edges and $\mathbf{C}$ is the set of contractions given by

$$\mathbf{C} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ e \in \mathcal{E}_\pi : \ e \subset N_{\mathcal{B}}(S) \} .$$

There is a natural bijection between $K_{\mathcal{B}}(\pi, S)$ and $\mathbf{G}$ when each are viewed just as sets of edges and a corresponding bijection between $\mathbf{N}^{K_{\mathcal{B}}(\pi,S)}$ and $\mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{G}}$. In what follows, we abuse notation and treat this bijection as an identification. As a start we define $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}} \subset \mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{G}}$ by setting $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathring{\mathcal{N}}_S(\mathbf{j})$.

For each $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}$ we define a function $F^{\mathbf{k}} \in \mathscr{C}_{\mathcal{V}}$ by setting

$$F^{\mathbf{k}}(y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Cu}_{\pi,\mathbf{k}}^{L_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}(y) \mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}(y) \hat{H}^{\mathbf{k}}_{C_{\mathcal{B}}(S)} \Big[\mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{K_{\mathcal{B}}^{\partial}(S)} [\mathscr{Y}^{\#}_{S,\mathbb{M}} \varphi] \Big] (x \sqcup y) .$$

So we then have

$$\hat{H}^{\mathbf{j}}_S[\varphi](x \sqcup y_{\varrho_S}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathring{\mathcal{N}}_S(\mathbf{j})} \int_{\tilde{N}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)} dy \ F^{\mathbf{k}}(y) .$$

We now define a total homogeneity ς on the trees of $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}}$ (see Definitions A.1 and A.3 below) by setting

$$\varsigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\bar{\omega}^{\#}(S) \delta^{\uparrow}[\mathcal{V}] + \sum_{e \in K_{\mathcal{B}}(S)} \mathfrak{h}(e) \delta^{\uparrow}[e] + \varsigma^{\mathbf{C}} + \varsigma^{R} + \sum_{T \in C_{\mathcal{B}}(S)} \omega(T) \delta^{\uparrow}[\varrho_T] , \quad (8.27)$$

where the total homogeneity $\varsigma^{\mathbf{C}}$ is given by

$$\varsigma^{\mathbf{C}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\substack{B \in \pi \\ B \subset L_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}} \mathfrak{c}^B . \quad (8.28)$$

The total homogeneity $\mathfrak{c}^B$ on the coalescence trees of $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}}$ is defined in Definition A.21. The total homogeneity ς^R is given by setting, for each $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}}$,

$$\varsigma^R_{\mathbf{T}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{B \in R(\mathbf{T})} \ell(B) \Big(\delta^{\Uparrow}_{\mathbf{T}}[B] - \delta^{\uparrow}_{\mathbf{T}}[B] \Big), \text{ where}$$

$$R(\mathbf{T}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ B \in R(\pi) : \ B \subset L_{\mathcal{B}}(S) \text{ and } \mathbf{L}_{B^{\uparrow}} = B \} .$$

The notations $R(\pi)$ and $\ell(B)$ were defined in (8.7). In Lemma 8.12 we establish that ς is subdivergence free on $\mathcal{V}$. Taking this for granted for the moment, we check the other conditions of Theorem A.10. Observe that the total homogeneity ς is of

order $\omega(S) - \bar{\omega}(S)^{\#}$ which is negative when $S \in \mathcal{D}$ and positive when $S \in \mathcal{S}$. Additionally, one has

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G},>\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)} & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{D}\,, \\ \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G},\leq\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)} & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{S}\,. \end{cases}$$

We are then done if we can exhibit a modification of $\tilde{F} = (\tilde{F}^{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}} \in \mathrm{Mod}(F)$ such that $\tilde{F}$ is is bounded by ς in the sense of Definition A.4 with

$$\|\tilde{F}\|_{\varsigma,\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{S,\mathbf{j}}(x) \cdot 2^{\bar{\omega}^{\#}(S)\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)} \|K(S)\|_{\mathfrak{t}} \cdot \|\xi\|_{|L(S)|,\mathfrak{c}}\,. \tag{8.29}$$

For any $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}$ we will set

$$\tilde{F}^{\mathbf{k}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} F^{\mathbf{k}} & \text{if } R(\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{k})) = \emptyset\,, \\ \mathring{F}^{\mathbf{k}} & \text{if } R(\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{k})) \neq \emptyset\,. \end{cases}$$

We will define $\mathring{F}^{\mathbf{k}}$ on a tree by tree basis later. It suffices to check the domain condition and desired supremum bound in each of the two cases separately.

We treat the first case. The domain condition (A.2) is easy to check so we turn to the desired supremum bounds needed for (8.29).

Fix $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}}$ with $R(\mathbf{T}) = \emptyset$. We now obtain the desired uniform in $\mathbf{s} \in \mathrm{Lab}_{\mathbf{T}}$ and $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G},\mathrm{tr}}(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{s})$ estimates. Fix appropriate $\mathbf{s}$ and $\mathbf{k}$, we start by applying the inductive hypothesis to $\hat{H}^{\bullet}_{C_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}$ along with Lemmas 8.8, 8.9, and 8.10 which yields

$$\begin{aligned} |F^{\mathbf{k}}(y)| &\lesssim \Big(\prod_{T\in C_{\mathcal{B}}(S)} 2^{\omega(T)\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{k}}(T)}\|K(T)\|_{\mathfrak{t}} \cdot \|\xi\|_{|L(T)|,\mathfrak{c}}\Big) \cdot \Big\|\mathscr{Y}_S^{\#}\varphi\Big\|_{C_{\mathcal{B}}(S),\mathbf{k}}(x \sqcup y) \\ &\quad \cdot \Big|\mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}(y \sqcup x_{\varrho_S})\mathrm{Cu}_{\pi,\mathbf{k}}^{L_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}(y \sqcup x_{\varrho_S})\Big| \cdot \Big\|\mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}\Big\|_{C_{\mathcal{B}}(S),\mathbf{k}}(x \sqcup y) \\ &\lesssim \|\varphi\|_{S,\mathbf{j}}(x) \cdot 2^{\bar{\omega}^{\#}(S)\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)} \\ &\quad \cdot 2^{-\bar{\omega}^{\#}(S)\mathrm{int}^{\mathbf{k}}(S)}\Big(\prod_{T\in C_{\mathcal{B}}(S)} 2^{\omega(T)\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{k}}(T)}\|K(T)\|_{\mathfrak{t}} \cdot \|\xi\|_{|L(T)|,\mathfrak{c}}\Big) \\ &\quad \cdot \Big|\mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}(y \sqcup x_{\varrho_S})\mathrm{Cu}_{\pi,\mathbf{k}}^{L_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}(y \sqcup x_{\varrho_S})\Big| \cdot \Big\|\mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}\Big\|_{C_{\mathcal{B}}(S),\mathbf{k}}(x \sqcup y)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{8.30}$$

The desired bound follows using the supremum estimates

$$\Big|\mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}(y \sqcup x_{\varrho_S})\mathrm{Cu}_{\pi,\mathbf{k}}^{L_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}(y \sqcup x_{\varrho_S})\Big| \lesssim \|\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)\|_{\mathfrak{t}}\|\xi\|_{L_{\mathcal{B}}(S),\mathfrak{c}} \cdot 2^{\langle \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}}^{C} + \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}}[\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)],\mathbf{s}\rangle}$$
$$\text{and } \Big\|\mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}\Big\|_{C_{\mathcal{B}}(S),\mathbf{k}}(x \sqcup y) \lesssim \|K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)\|_{\mathfrak{t}} \cdot 2^{\langle \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}}[\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)],\mathbf{s}\rangle}\,.$$

Now fix $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}}$ with $R(\mathbf{T}) \neq \emptyset$. For any $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}$ with $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{k}) = \mathbf{T}$ we set, for $y \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\mathcal{V}_0}$,

$$\mathring{F}^{\mathbf{k}}(y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Cu}_{\pi,\mathbf{k}}^{L_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}(y \sqcup x_{\varrho_S}) \cdot \Big(\prod_{B\in R(\mathbf{T})}(1 - \mathscr{Y}_B)\Big)[G^{\mathbf{k}}](x \sqcup y),\ \text{where}$$

$$G^{\mathbf{k}}(x \sqcup y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}(y \sqcup x_{\varrho_S}) \hat{H}^{\mathbf{k}}_{C_{\mathcal{B}}(S)} \Big[\mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)} (\mathscr{Y}_S^{\#} \varphi) \Big](x \sqcup y) \,,$$

and the notation $\mathscr{Y}_B$ was defined in (8.8). Clearly

$$F^{\mathbf{k}}(y) - \mathring{F}^{\mathbf{k}}(y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Cu}_{\pi,\mathbf{k}}^{L_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}(y \sqcup x_{\varrho_S}) \cdot \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{A} \subset R(\mathbf{T}) \\ \mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset}} \Big(\prod_{B \in \mathcal{A}} (-\mathscr{Y}_B) \Big) [G^{\mathbf{k}}](x \sqcup y) \,.$$

We claim that for each fixed x and for each $\mathcal{A}$ in the above sum the integral over $y_{\mathcal{V}_0}$ of the corresponding summand vanishes. Fixing $\mathcal{A}$ and expanding the summand completely yields a linear combination of terms - in each individual term all the dependence on $y_{(+,B)}$ can extracted as a factor of the form

$$(y_{(+,B)} - z_{(-,B)})^n \widetilde{\mathrm{Cu}}_{B,k_B}(z_B) \,,$$

where $z = y \sqcup x_{\varrho_*}$ and $n \in \mathbf{N}^d$ with $|n|_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq \ell(B)$. Since $B \in R(\overline{\mathbf{T}})$ on must have $k_B > 0$ and therefore the above quantity vanishes when integrating $y_{(+,B)}$ by (6.2).

The required domain constraint for $\tilde{F}^{\mathbf{k}}$ is straightforward to check and for the supremum bound we observe that by the estimate of [Hai14, Prop. A.1] one has, uniform in $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{tr}}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{s})$, and in y with $y_{(+,B)} \overset{k_B}{\rightsquigarrow} y_{(-,B)}$ for every $B \in R(\mathbf{T})$ - which is required to be in the support of $\mathrm{Cu}_{\pi,\mathbf{k}}^{L_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}$ - the bound

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_y \Big| \Big(\prod_{B \in R(\mathbf{T})} (1 - \mathscr{Y}_B) \Big) [G^{\mathbf{k}}](x \sqcup y) \Big| \\ &\lesssim \sup_y \max_{\substack{f \in \overline{\mathrm{Der}}(R(\mathbf{T})) \\ a+b+c=f}} \Big(\prod_{B \in R(\mathbf{T})} 2^{|f_{(+,B)}|_{\mathfrak{s}} \mathbf{s}(B^{\uparrow})} \Big) |D^a \mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}(y)| \\ &\qquad \cdot |\hat{H}^{\mathbf{k}}_{C_{\mathcal{B}}(S)} \Big[(D^b \mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}) [D^c \mathscr{Y}^{\#}_{S,\mathbb{M}} \varphi] \Big](x \sqcup y)| \,, \end{aligned} \tag{8.31}$$

where $\overline{\mathrm{Der}}(R(\mathbf{T}))$ was defined in (8.10) and for the multi-indices $m = a, b, c, f$ and any $B \in \mathbf{R}(T)$ we use the notation $m_{(+,B)}$ for the multi-index which is given by m on the site $(+, B)$ but vanishes everywhere else. We proceed as earlier and use our inductive hypothesis along with Lemmas 8.9 and 8.10 to get

$$\begin{aligned} &|\hat{H}^{\mathbf{k}}_{C_{\mathcal{B}}(S)} \Big[(D^b \mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}) [D^c \mathscr{Y}^{\#}_{S,\mathbb{M}} \varphi] \Big](x \sqcup y)| \\ &\lesssim \Big(\prod_{T \in C_{\mathcal{B}}(S)} 2^{\omega(T) \mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{k}}(T)} \|K(T)\|_{\mathfrak{t}} \cdot \|\xi\|_{|L(T)|,\mathfrak{c}} \Big) \cdot \Big\| D^c \mathscr{Y}_S^{\#} \varphi \Big\|_{C_{\mathcal{B}}(S),\mathbf{k}} (x \sqcup y) \\ &\quad \cdot \Big\| D^b \mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)} \Big\|_{C_{\mathcal{B}}(S),\mathbf{k}} (y) \\ &\lesssim \Big(\prod_{T \in C_{\mathcal{B}}(S)} 2^{\omega(T) \mathbf{s}(\varrho_T^{\uparrow})} \|K(T)\|_{\mathfrak{t}} \cdot \|\xi\|_{|L(T)|,\mathfrak{c}} \Big) \cdot 2^{\bar{\omega}^{\#}(S) \mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)} 2^{-\bar{\omega}^{\#}(S) \mathbf{s}(\varrho_{\mathbf{T}})} \|\varphi\|_{S,\mathbf{j}}(x) \\ &\quad \cdot \Big\| K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{B}}(S) \Big\|_{\mathfrak{t}} \cdot 2^{\langle \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}}[K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)], \mathbf{s} \rangle} \Big(\prod_{B \in \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{T})} 2^{|b_{(+,B)} + c_{(+,B)}|_{\mathfrak{s}} \mathbf{s}(B^{\Uparrow})} \Big) \,. \end{aligned} \tag{8.32}$$

In the last inequality above the key observation is that for each $B \in R(\mathbf{T})$, the scale $\mathbf{s}(B^{\Uparrow})$ dominates the scale $\mathbf{s}(\cdot)$ at which we would pay the cost of $|b_{(+,B)}|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ or $|c_{(+,B)}|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ with regards to Lemmas 8.9 and 8.10. Similarly, one has the bound

$$|D^a \mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{k}}^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}(y)| \lesssim \|\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)\|_{\mathfrak{t}} 2^{\langle \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}}[\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{B}}(S)],\mathbf{s}\rangle} \prod_{B\in\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{T})} 2^{|a_{(+,B)}|_{\mathfrak{s}}\mathbf{s}(B^{\Uparrow})}\Big) \,. \tag{8.33}$$

Inserting (8.32) and (8.33) into (8.31) we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_y \Big|\Big(\prod_{B\in R(\mathbf{T})}(1-\mathscr{Y}_B)\Big)[\tilde{G}^{\mathbf{k}}](x\sqcup y)\Big| \qquad (8.34)\\ &\lesssim \|K_{\mathcal{B}}(S)\|_{\mathfrak{t}} 2^{\langle \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}}[K_{\mathcal{B}}(S)],\mathbf{s}\rangle}\Big(\prod_{T\in C_{\mathcal{B}}(S)} 2^{\omega(T)\mathbf{s}(\varrho_T^{\uparrow})}\|\xi\|_{|L(T)|,\mathfrak{c}}\Big)\cdot 2^{\bar{\omega}^{\#}(S)\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)}\\ &\quad\cdot 2^{-\bar{\omega}^{\#}(S)\mathbf{s}(\varrho_{\mathbf{T}})}\|\varphi\|_{S,\mathbf{j}}(x)\cdot \max_{\substack{f\in\overline{\mathrm{Der}}(R(\mathbf{T}))\\ a+b+c=f}}\Big(\prod_{B\in R(\mathbf{T})} 2^{|f_{(+,B)}|_{\mathfrak{s}}[\mathbf{s}(B^{\Uparrow})-\mathbf{s}(B^{\uparrow})]}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

The desired supremum bound is then obtained by noticing that the maximum of the last factor is obtained when $|f_{(+,B)}|_{\mathfrak{s}} = \ell(B)$ for each $B \in R(\mathbf{T})$ and by combining this with the earlier used supremum bound on $\mathrm{Cu}_{\pi,\mathbf{k}}^{L_{\mathcal{B}}(S)}$. This concludes the proof of (8.29).

We now prove the inductive step for the easier induction - let $n, m \geq 1$ and suppose that (8.25) has been proven for every forest $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{B}$ of depth 1 with either $\mathrm{depth}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{G}) \leq n$ or $\mathrm{depth}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{G}) = n+1$ and $|\mathcal{G}| \leq m$.

Now suppose $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{B}$ is of depth 1, $\mathrm{depth}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{F}) = n+1$, and $|\mathcal{F}| = m+1$. We prove (8.25) in this case. Fix $S \in \mathcal{F}$ and write $\mathcal{G} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{F}\setminus\{S\}$, then for $x \in \mathbf{R}^{\tilde{N}(\mathcal{F})^c}$,

$$\hat{H}^{\mathbf{j}}_{\mathcal{F}}[\varphi](x) = \hat{H}^{\mathbf{j}}_{\mathcal{G}}\Big[\hat{H}^{\mathbf{j}}_{S}[\varphi]\Big](x)\,.$$

By applying the inductive hypothesis for $\mathcal{G}$ we have the bound

$$\Big|\hat{H}^{\mathbf{j}}_{\mathcal{F}}[\varphi](x)\Big| \lesssim \Big(\prod_{T\in\mathcal{G}} 2^{\omega(T)\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(T)}\|K(T)\|_{\mathfrak{t}}\cdot\|\xi\|_{|L(T)|,\mathfrak{c}}\Big)\Big\|\hat{H}^{\mathbf{j}}_{S}[\varphi]\Big\|_{\mathcal{G},\mathbf{j}}(x_{\tilde{N}(\mathcal{F})^c})\,.$$

It suffices to prove

$$\Big\|\hat{H}^{\mathbf{j}}_{S}[\varphi]\Big\|_{\mathcal{G},\mathbf{j}}(x) \lesssim 2^{\omega(S)\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)}\|K(S)\|_{\mathfrak{t}}\cdot\|\xi\|_{|L(S)|,\mathfrak{c}}\cdot\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{F},\mathbf{j}}(x)\,. \tag{8.35}$$

This is not hard to see since

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\hat{H}^{\mathbf{j}}_{S}[\varphi]\|_{\mathcal{G},\mathbf{j}}(x)\\ &= \sup\Big\{\Big|\Big(\mathbb{D}^{b,\mathbf{j}}_{\mathcal{G}}\hat{H}^{\mathbf{j}}_{S}[\varphi]\Big)(x,y)\Big| : \begin{array}{c} b\in\mathrm{Der}(\mathcal{G}) \text{ and}\\ y\in\mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{G},\mathbf{j},x)\end{array}\Big\}\\ &= \sup\Big\{\Big|\hat{H}^{\mathbf{j}}_{S}[\mathbb{D}^{b,\mathbf{j}}_{\mathcal{G}}\varphi](x,y)\Big| : \begin{array}{c} b\in\mathrm{Der}(\mathcal{G}) \text{ and}\\ y\in\mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{G},\mathbf{j},x)\end{array}\Big\}\end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim \sup \left\{ \left| \left(\mathbb{D}^{\bar{b},\mathbf{j}}_{\{S\}} \mathbb{D}^{b,\mathbf{j}}_{\mathcal{G}} \varphi \right)(x,y,z) \right| : \begin{array}{c} \bar{b} \in \mathrm{Der}(\{S\}),\ b \in \mathrm{Der}(\mathcal{G}), \\ y_{\tilde{N}_{\mathcal{G}}} \in \mathrm{Dom}(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{j}, x), \\ \text{and } z_{\tilde{N}(S)} \in \mathrm{Dom}(\{S\}, \mathbf{j}, x) \end{array} \right\}$$
$$\cdot\, 2^{\omega(S)\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)} \|K(S)\|_{\mathfrak{t}} \cdot \|\xi\|_{|L(S)|,\mathfrak{c}} \,,$$

where we used the inductive hypothesis for $\{S\}$ in the final inequality. □

In the following lemma and later sections we use the following notation: for any $K(\overline{T})$ connected subset $A \subset N(\overline{T})$ we write $T(A)$ for the maximal subtree of $\overline{T}$ with true node set A and also write $\varrho_A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varrho_{T(A)}$. Observe that if $e \in L(\overline{T})$ with $e_{\mathrm{p}} \in A$ then $e \in L(T(A))$.

Lemma 8.12 *In the context of Lemma 8.11, the total homogeneity ς given by* (8.27) *is subdivergence free in $N_{\mathcal{B}}(S)$ for the set of scales $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}$.*

Proof. Fix an arbitrary $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}}$. For any $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}$ we define

$$\mathbf{N}(a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{L}_a \sqcup \Big(\bigsqcup_{\substack{T \in C_{\mathcal{B}}(S) \\ \varrho_T \in \mathbf{L}_a}} \tilde{N}(T) \Big) \,. \tag{8.36}$$

We also set

$$\mathcal{Q} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big\{ \mathbf{N}(a) :\ a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}} \setminus \{\varrho_{\mathbf{T}}\} \Big\} \,. \tag{8.37}$$

Observe that $N(T) \notin \mathcal{Q}$ for any $T \in C_{\mathcal{B}}(S)$ and that any node-set $M \in \mathcal{Q}$ is edge connected by $K(\pi, S)$.

We define a map $\tilde{\varsigma} : 2^{N(S)} \setminus \{\emptyset\} \to \mathbf{R}$ as follows - for $M \subset N(S)$ we set

$$\tilde{\varsigma}(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\substack{e \in K(S) \\ e \subset M}} \mathfrak{h}(e) - \Big(\sum_{\substack{B \in \pi, \\ B \not\subset M}} |\mathfrak{t}(B \cap M)|_{\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{c}} \Big) \tag{8.38}$$
$$- (|M| - 1)|\mathfrak{s}| - \sum_{\substack{B \in \pi \\ B \subset M}} \Big[|\mathfrak{t}(B)|_{\mathfrak{s}} + \mathfrak{f}(B) \mathbb{1}\{M = B\} \Big] \,.$$

Observe that if $M \subset N(S)$ is $K(S)$-connected then $\tilde{\varsigma}(M) \leq -|T(M)^0_{\mathfrak{t}}|_{\mathfrak{s}}$. Furthermore, it is straightforward to check that for any $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}} \setminus \{\varrho_{\mathbf{T}}\}$,

$$\sum_{b \in \mathbf{T}_{\geq a}} \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}}(b) - (|\mathbf{L}_a| - 1)|\mathfrak{s}| = \tilde{\varsigma}(\mathbf{N}(a)) \,. \tag{8.39}$$

Our desired result will follow if we show $\tilde{\varsigma}(M) < 0$ for all $M \in \mathcal{Q}$. We do this by splitting into various cases. While we are not always explicit about it, at each point in this proof we are always restricting ourselves to the complement of the cases treated previously.

For the case $|M| = 2$ the desired result is immediate while for $M \subset L(S)$ with $|M| > 2$ we simply observe that

$$\tilde{\varsigma}(M) < (2|M|/3 - |M| - 1)|\mathfrak{s}| < 0 \, . \tag{8.40}$$

Next we treat the case where M is not $K(S)$ connected. Then, for some $k \geq 1$,

$$M = \Big(\bigsqcup_{j=1}^{k} M_j \Big) \sqcup \tilde{M} \, , \tag{8.41}$$

where the M_j are the $K(S)$-components of M of cardinality at least 2 and $\tilde{M}$ is given by the union of the $K(S)$-components of M of cardinality 1, note $\tilde{M} \subset L(S)$ since M must be $K(\pi, S)$-connected. We then have

$$\tilde{\varsigma}(M) \leq -(k-1)|\mathfrak{s}| - \sum_{j=1}^{k} |T(M_j)^0_{\mathfrak{c}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{t}(e_{\mathfrak{c}}(\tilde{M}))|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{s}| \cdot |\tilde{M}| \, . \tag{8.42}$$

We now observe that if $(k, |\tilde{M}|) = (1, 1)$ then the LHS is strictly negative by Assumption 2.18 item 2. For more general values of $(k, |\tilde{M}|)$ we use, for each j, the bound $-|T(M_j)^0_{\mathfrak{c}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} < |\mathfrak{s}|/2$ (from Assumption 2.18 item 1). The LHS is then strictly bounded above by

$$-(k/2 - 1)|\mathfrak{s}| - |\mathfrak{t}(e_{\mathfrak{c}}(\tilde{M}))|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{s}||\tilde{M}|$$

which, by using Assumption 2.17, is bounded above by $-\Big(\frac{3k+2|\tilde{M}|}{6} - 1\Big)|\mathfrak{s}|$. We are finished with this case upon observing that this last quantity is non-negative whenever one enforces the combination of constraints (i) $k \geq 1$, (ii) $|\tilde{M}| \neq 1$, and (iii) $k + |\tilde{M}| \geq 2$.

Now suppose that $M \in \mathcal{Q}$, is $K(S)$-connected, and $T(M)$ is not compatible with π. It follows that there exists some $B \in \pi$ with $B \not\subset L(T(M))$ and $B \cap L(T(M)) \neq \emptyset$. Then one has

$$\tilde{\varsigma}(M) = -|T(M)^0_{\mathfrak{c}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} + (|\mathfrak{t}(B \cap L(T(M)))|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{t}(B \cap L(T(M)))|_{\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{c}}) < 0 \, ,$$

where the final inequality comes from the definition of $\mathfrak{c}$-super-regularity.

We are now left with the case that $M \in \mathcal{Q}$, $|M| > 2$, M is $K(S)$-connected, and $T(M)$ is compatible with π.

In this case $\tilde{\varsigma}(M) = -|T(M)^0_{\mathfrak{c}}|_{\mathfrak{s}}$. We claim that $|T(M)^0_{\mathfrak{c}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} > 0$ - if this was not true then one would have $T(M) \in \mathrm{Div}$ - combining this with the fact that $T(M)$ is compatible with $\mathcal{B}$ and π would force $T \notin \mathcal{Q}$ by the definition of the set of scale assignments $\mathring{\mathcal{N}}_S$. □

8.3.3 Estimates with positive renormalizations

To make formulas more readable we introduce the notation $\exp_2[t] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2^t$ for $t \in \mathbf{R}$.

Lemma 8.13 *Let $e \in \mathscr{B}$. Uniform in $\mathbf{j} \in \partial\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{B},\lambda}$, any multi-index k supported on $\{e_{\mathrm{c}}, e_{\mathrm{p}}\}$, and $x = (x_\circledast, x_{e_{\mathrm{c}}}, x_{\varepsilon_{\mathrm{p}}})$ such that $x_{e_{\mathrm{c}}} \overset{j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{c}})}}{\longleftrightarrow} x_\circledast$ and $x_{e_{\mathrm{p}}} \overset{j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{p}})}}{\longleftrightarrow} x_\circledast$, one has the estimate*

$$\left| D^k \widetilde{\mathrm{RKer}}^{\{e\}}_{0,\mathbf{j}}(x) \right| \lesssim \|K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}\|_{\mathfrak{t}(e)} 2^{\eta(j_e, j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{p}})}, j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{c}})}, k_{e_{\mathrm{c}}}, k_{e_{\mathrm{p}}}, e)}$$

where $\eta(j_e, j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{p}})}, j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{c}})}, k_{e_{\mathrm{c}}}, k_{e_{\mathrm{p}}}, e)$ is given by

$$\begin{cases} \gamma(e)(j_e - j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{p}})}) + (\mathfrak{h}(e) + |k_{e_{\mathrm{c}}}|_{\mathfrak{s}})j_e + |k_{e_{\mathrm{p}}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{p}})} & \text{if } e \in \mathscr{D}, \\ -(\gamma(e) - 1 + |k_{e_{\mathrm{p}}}|_{\mathfrak{s}})j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{p}})} + (|k_{e_{\mathrm{c}}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} + \mathfrak{h}(e) + \gamma(e) - 1)j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{c}})} & \text{if } e \in \mathscr{S}\ . \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, the LHS vanishes unless the condition $x_{e_{\mathrm{c}}} \overset{j_e}{\longleftrightarrow} x_{e_{\mathrm{p}}}$ holds.

Proof. We prove the lemma in the case when $k = 0$, upon inspection of how each type of derivative modifies a Taylor expansion (or Taylor remainder) then the estimate for $k \neq 0$ follows easily.

We first treat the case when $e \in \mathscr{D}$ in which case $\widetilde{\mathrm{RKer}}^{\{e\}}_{0,\mathbf{j}}(x)$ is given by

$$\Big(\mathrm{Ker}^{\{e\}}_0(x_{e_{\mathrm{p}}}, x_{e_{\mathrm{c}}}) - \sum_{m \in \mathrm{Der}(e)} \frac{(x_{e_{\mathrm{p}}} - x_\circledast)^m}{m!} (D^m \mathrm{Ker}^{\{e\}}_0)(x_\circledast, x_{e_{\mathrm{c}}})\Big) \Psi^{j_e}(x_{e_{\mathrm{p}}} - x_{e_{\mathrm{c}}}), \tag{8.43}$$

where $\mathrm{Der}(e)$ denotes the set of multi-indices supported on e_{p} with $|m|_{\mathfrak{s}} < \gamma(e)$. By using [Hai14, Prop. A.1] it follows that, uniform in x satisfying $x_{e_{\mathrm{p}}} \overset{j_e}{\longleftrightarrow} x_{e_{\mathrm{c}}}$ (enforced by the second factor of (8.43)) and $x_{e_{\mathrm{p}}} \overset{j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{p}})}}{\longleftrightarrow} x_\circledast$ one has a bound

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big| \mathrm{Ker}^{\{e\}}_0(x_{e_{\mathrm{p}}}, x_{e_{\mathrm{c}}}) - \sum_{m \in \mathrm{Der}(e)} \frac{(x_{e_{\mathrm{p}}} - x_\circledast)^m}{m!} (D^m \mathrm{Ker}^{\{e\}}_0)(x_\circledast, x_{e_{\mathrm{c}}}) \Big| \\ &\lesssim \sup_{n \in \partial_{e_{\mathrm{p}}} \mathrm{Der}(e)} |x_{e_{\mathrm{p}}} - x_\circledast|^{|n|_s} \cdot \sup_{\substack{y, y' \in \mathbf{R}^d \\ y \overset{j_e}{\longleftrightarrow} y'}} |D^n \mathrm{Ker}^{\{e\}}_0(y, y')| \\ &\lesssim \max_{n \in \partial_{e_{\mathrm{p}}} \mathrm{Der}(e)} 2^{-j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{p}})}|n|_s} \cdot \|K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}\|_{\mathfrak{t}(e)} \cdot 2^{(\mathfrak{h}(e) + |n|_{\mathfrak{s}})j_e}\ . \end{aligned}$$

Note that in this scenario the use of the scale j_e vs $j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{c}})}$ is interchangeable - the combinations of the conditions $x_{e_{\mathrm{p}}} \overset{j_e}{\longleftrightarrow} x_{e_{\mathrm{c}}}$, $x_{e_{\mathrm{p}}} \overset{j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{p}})}}{\longleftrightarrow} x_\circledast$, and $x_{e_{\mathrm{c}}} \overset{j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{c}})}}{\longleftrightarrow} x_\circledast$ and the triangle inequality mean that there exists some combinatorial constant $C > 0$ such that if $|j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{c}})} - j_e| \leq C$ does not hold then our domain in x is empty.

The desired bound now follows upon using the constraint $x_{e_{\mathrm{p}}} \overset{j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{p}})}}{\longleftrightarrow} x_\circledast$, the fact that $j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{p}})} > j_e$, and that $\min_{n \in \partial_{e_{\mathrm{p}}} \mathrm{Der}(e)} |n|_{\mathfrak{s}} = \gamma(e)$. Now we turn into the case

where $e \in \mathscr{S}$. By a similar triangle inequality argument we may assume that there exists some combinatorial constant $C > 0$ such that

$$j_{(\circledast,e_c)} + C \geq j_e \geq j_{(\circledast,e_p)} \,. \tag{8.44}$$

Under this assumption we do a term by term estimate which gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big| \sum_{m \in \mathrm{Der}(e)} \frac{(x_{e_p} - x_\circledast)^m}{m!} D^m \mathrm{Ker}_0^{\{e\}}(x_\circledast, x_{e_c}) \Big| \\
&\lesssim \max_{m \in \mathrm{Der}(e)} |(x_{e_p} - x_\circledast)^m| \cdot \sup_{\substack{y,y' \in \mathbf{R}^d \\ y \overset{j_{(\circledast,e_c)}}{\longleftrightarrow} y'}} |D^m \mathrm{Ker}_0^{\{e\}})(y,y')| \\
&\lesssim \|K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}\|_{\mathfrak{t}(e)} \cdot \max_{m \in \mathrm{Der}(e)} 2^{(\mathfrak{h}(e) + |m|_{\mathfrak{s}}) j_{(\circledast,e_c)} - |m|_{\mathfrak{s}} j_{(\circledast,e_p)}} \\
&\lesssim \|K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}\|_{\mathfrak{t}(e)} \cdot 2^{(\mathfrak{h}(e) + \gamma(e) - 1) j_{(\circledast,e_c)} - (\gamma(e)-1) j_{(\circledast,e_p)}} \,,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the final inequality we used (8.44) and that $\max_{m \in \mathrm{Der}(e)} |m|_{\mathfrak{s}} = \gamma(e) - 1$. □

Lemma 8.14 *Let $S \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}$ and $k \in (\mathbf{N}^d)^{N^*}$ be supported on $N^{\downarrow}(S) \sqcup \{\varrho_S\}$. One has, uniform in $\mathbf{j} \in \partial\mathcal{N}_S$ and $x \in \mathbf{R}^{\tilde{N}(S)^c}$ satisfying*

$$x_{\varrho_S} \overset{j_{(\circledast,\varrho_S)}}{\longleftrightarrow} x_\circledast \,, \quad x_{e_c} \overset{j_{(\circledast,e_c)}}{\longleftrightarrow} x_\circledast \quad \forall e \in K^{\downarrow}(S) \,,$$

the bound,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big| D^k \hat{H}_S^{\mathbf{j}} \Big[\widetilde{\mathrm{RKer}}_{0,\mathbf{j}}^{\mathscr{B} \cap K^{\downarrow}(S)} \mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{j}}^{K^{\downarrow}(S) \setminus \mathscr{B}} \mathrm{X}_{\overline{\mathfrak{n}},\mathbf{j},\circledast}^{\tilde{N}(S)} \Big](x) \Big| \\
&\lesssim \exp_2 \Big[\omega(S) \mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S) + j_{(\varrho_S,\circledast)} |\overline{\mathfrak{n}}(\tilde{N}(S))|_{\mathfrak{s}} + \sum_{e \in K^{\downarrow}(S) \setminus \mathscr{B}} (\mathfrak{h}(e) + |k_{e_c}|_{\mathfrak{s}}) j_e \\
&\qquad + \Big(\sum_{e \in K^{\downarrow}(S) \cap \mathscr{S}} -(\gamma(e)-1) j_{(\circledast,\varrho_S)} + (\mathfrak{h}(e) + |k_{e_c}|_{\mathfrak{s}} + \gamma(e) - 1) j_{(\circledast,e_c)} \Big) \\
&\qquad + \Big(\sum_{e \in K^{\downarrow}(S) \cap \mathscr{D}} \gamma(e)(j_e - j_{(\circledast,\varrho_S)}) + (\mathfrak{h}(e) + |k_{e_c}|_{\mathfrak{s}}) j_e \Big) \Big] \\
&\qquad \cdot \|\overline{K}^{\downarrow}(S)\|_{\mathfrak{t}} \cdot \|\xi\|_{|L(S)|} \,.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.45}$$

Furthermore, there exists a combinatorial constant $C > 0$ such that the LHS vanishes unless $x_{\varrho_S} \overset{j_e}{\longleftrightarrow} x_{e_c}$ for all $e \in K^{\downarrow}(S)$, and $|j_{(\circledast,u)} - j_{(\circledast,\varrho_S)}| \leq +C$ for each $u \in \tilde{N}(S)$.

Proof. First observe that the differential operator D^k commutes with $\hat{H}_S^{\mathbf{j}}$. We use Lemma 8.25, the desired bound is obtained by estimating $\|D^k \Theta\|_{S,\mathbf{j}}(x_{\tilde{N}(S)^c})$ where

Θ is given by either: $\mathrm{X}^{\{u\}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{n}},\mathbf{j},\circledast}$ for $u \in \tilde{N}(S)$, $\mathrm{Ker}^{\{e\}}_{0,\mathbf{j}}$ for $e \in K^{\downarrow}(S)$, or $\widetilde{\mathrm{RKer}}^{\{e\}}_{0,\mathbf{j}}$ for $e \in K^{\downarrow}(S) \cap \mathscr{B}$.

The proof of the first two scenarios mirror that of Lemma 8.9 and one obtains

$$\|D^k \Theta\|_{S,\mathbf{j}}(x_{\tilde{N}(S)^c}) \lesssim \begin{cases} 2^{-|\bar{\mathfrak{n}}(u)|_{\mathfrak{s}} j_{(\circledast,u)}} \mathbb{1}\{x_{\varrho_S} \overset{j_{(\circledast,u)}}{\longleftrightarrow} x_{\circledast}\} & \text{if } \Theta = \mathrm{X}^{\{u\}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{n}},\mathbf{j},\circledast} \,, \\ 2^{(\mathfrak{h}(e)+|k_{e_c}|_{\mathfrak{s}})j_e} \|K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}\|_{\mathfrak{t}(e)} \mathbb{1}\{x_{\varrho_S} \overset{j_e}{\longleftrightarrow} x_{e_c}\} & \text{if } \Theta = \mathrm{Ker}^{\{e\}}_{0,\mathbf{j}} \,. \end{cases}$$

Our bound for the factor $\mathrm{X}^{\tilde{N}(S)}_{\bar{\mathfrak{n}},\circledast,\mathbf{j}}$ then gives us the constraint that $x_{\varrho_S} \overset{j_{(\circledast,u)}}{\longleftrightarrow} x_{\circledast}$ for every $u \in \tilde{N}(S)$. Combining this with the inherited $x_{\varrho_S} \overset{j_{(\circledast,\varrho_S)}}{\longleftrightarrow} x_{\circledast}$ constraint it follows that there exists a combinatorial constant $C > 0$ such that the LHS of (8.45) vanishes unless

$$|j_{(\circledast,u)} - j_{(\circledast,\varrho_S)}| \le C \text{ for every } u \in \tilde{N}(S) \,. \tag{8.46}$$

We now turn to the case where $\Theta = \widetilde{\mathrm{RKer}}^{\{e\}}_{0,\mathbf{j}}$ for $e \in K^{\downarrow}(S) \cap \mathscr{B}$ which further splits into two subcases depending on whether $e \in \mathscr{D}$ or $e \in \mathscr{S}$. We claim that one has

$$\|D^k \widetilde{\mathrm{RKer}}^{\{e\}}_{0,\mathbf{j}}\|_{S,\mathbf{j}}(x_{\tilde{N}(S)^c}) \lesssim \mathbb{1}\{x_{\varrho_S} \overset{j_e}{\longleftrightarrow} x_{e_c}\} \|K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}\|_{\mathfrak{t}(e)} 2^{\eta(j_e, j_{(\circledast,\varrho_S)}, j_{(\circledast,e_c)}, k_{e_c}, 0, e)} \,,$$

where $\eta(\cdot)$ is as in the statement of Lemma 8.13. We only sketch the proofs here since the details are very similar to those of Lemma 8.13.

Writing $\widetilde{\mathrm{RKer}}^{\{e\}}_{0,\mathbf{j}}(z) = \widetilde{\mathrm{RKer}}^{\{e\}}_{0,\mathbf{j}}(z_{e_p}, z_{e_c}, z_{\circledast})$ we claim that for any $b \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Der}}(\{S\})$ we have, using a Taylor remainder bound or a term-by-term Taylor series bound, the following estimate, uniform $\mathbf{j} \in \partial\mathcal{N}_S$ satisfying (8.46) and in $x_{\tilde{N}(S)^c}$ satisfying both $x_{\varrho_S} \overset{j_{(\circledast,\varrho_S)}}{\longleftrightarrow} x_{\circledast}$ and $x_{e_c} \overset{j_{(\circledast,e_c)}}{\longleftrightarrow} x_{\circledast}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{y_{\tilde{N}(S)} \in \mathrm{Dom}(\{S\},\mathbf{j},x)} \left| D^{b+k} \widetilde{\mathrm{RKer}}^{\{e\}}_{0,\mathbf{j}}(y_{e_p}, x_{e_c}, x_{\circledast}) \right| \qquad (8.47) \\ &\lesssim \sup_{\substack{y_{\tilde{N}(S)} \in \mathrm{Dom}(\{S\},\mathbf{j},x_{\varrho_S}) \\ n \in A_e}} |y_{u(e)} - x_{\circledast}|^{|n|_s - |b_{e_p}|_{\mathfrak{s}}} \cdot \sup_{\substack{w,w' \in \mathbf{R}^d \\ w \overset{j_e}{\longleftrightarrow} w'}} |D^{n+k_{e_c}} \mathrm{Ker}^{\{e\}}_0(w - w')| \\ &\lesssim \|K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}\|_{\mathfrak{t}(e)} \cdot 2^{(\mathfrak{h}(e)+|k_{e_c}|_{\mathfrak{s}})\theta_2(\mathbf{j},e) + |b_{e_p}|_{\mathfrak{s}} j_{(\circledast,\varrho_S)}} \max_{n \in A_e} 2^{|n|_{\mathfrak{s}} \theta_1(\mathbf{j},e)} . \end{aligned}$$

Here, if $e \in \mathscr{D}$ one has $u(e) \overset{\text{def}}{=} e_p$, $A_e \overset{\text{def}}{=} \partial_{e_p}\mathrm{Der}(e)$, $\theta_1(\mathbf{j}, e) \overset{\text{def}}{=} (j_e - j_{(\circledast,\varrho_S)})$, and $\theta_2(\mathbf{j}, e) \overset{\text{def}}{=} j_e$. On the other hand, if $e \in \mathscr{S}$ then $A_e \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Der}(e)$, $\theta_1(\mathbf{j}, e) \overset{\text{def}}{=} (j_{(\circledast,e_c)} - j_{(\circledast,\varrho_S)})$, and $\theta_2(\mathbf{j}, e) \overset{\text{def}}{=} j_{(\circledast,e_p)}$.

We also used $y_{e_p} \overset{j_{(\circledast,\varrho_S)}}{\longleftrightarrow} x_{\circledast}$ which comes from the inherited constraint $x_{\varrho_S} \overset{j_{(\circledast,\varrho_S)}}{\longleftrightarrow} x_{\circledast}$ along with the domain of the supremum for y_{e_p}. Naively one would also want to use $j_{(\circledast,\varrho_S)} > j_e$ if $e \in \mathscr{D}$ or $j_{(\circledast,\varrho_S)} \le j_e$ if $e \in \mathscr{S}$. However, by (8.46) there is a combinatorial constant $C' > 0$ such that $j_{(\circledast,e_p)} + C' > j_e$ if $e \in \mathscr{D}$

and $j_{(\circledast,e_{\mathrm{p}})} \le j_e + C'$ if $e \in \mathscr{S}$ which is good enough, the discrepancies C' only contributes to the constant of proportionality in our bound.

The desired bound on $\|\widetilde{\mathrm{RKer}}^{\{e\}}_{0,\mathbf{j}}\|_{S,\mathbf{j}}(x_{\tilde{N}(S)^c})$ follows from (8.47) by observing from multipling the last line of (8.47) by $2^{-\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S)|b|_{e_{\mathrm{p}}}}\,\mathrm{ext}^{\mathbf{j}}(S) \ge j_{(\circledast,\varrho_S)}$ and using the observation of the above paragraph when taking the maximum over n. For the indicator function on the RHS one observes that the LHS of (8.47) vanishes unless $x_{\varrho_S} \overset{j_e}{\longleftrightarrow} x_{e_{\mathrm{c}}}$, this follows by similar reasoning as in Lemma 8.9. □

8.4 Full control over a single tree

A straightforward application of the triangle inequality gives the following lemma.

Lemma 8.15 *One can choose a combinatorial constant $C > 0$ such that if one sets*

$$\partial\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{B},\lambda,\mathrm{tri}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \big\{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{B},\lambda} :\ \forall T \in \overline{\mathcal{B}},\ e \in \mathcal{E}_{\circledast}(T),\ |j_{(\circledast,\varrho_T)} - j_e| < C\big\},$$

then $\mathring{\mathcal{W}}^{\mathbf{j}}_{\lambda}(x)$ vanishes for every $\mathbf{j} \in \partial\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{B},\lambda} \setminus \partial\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{B},\lambda,\mathrm{tri}}$.

We define and fix $\partial\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{B},\lambda,\mathrm{tri}}$ using a sufficiently large value of C so the above lemma holds. In preparation for the next section we will now modify our setting, replacing the graph $\overline{T}^*$ with a quotient graph. The vertex set for this graph will be given by $\mathcal{X} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{N}(\overline{\mathcal{B}})^c$. We also write $\mathcal{X}_0 \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{X} \setminus \{\circledast\}$, indicating that $\circledast$ is the pinned vertex of $\mathcal{X}$.

We also define a map $\mathfrak{q} : N^* \sqcup (N^*)^{(2)} \to \mathcal{X} \sqcup \mathcal{X}^{(2)}$ via setting, first, for $v \in N^*$

$$\mathfrak{q}(v) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \varrho_T & \text{if } v \in \tilde{N}(T) \text{ for } T \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}, \\ v & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and for $\{a,b\} \in N^*$ setting $\mathfrak{q}(\{a,b\}) = \{\mathfrak{q}(a),\mathfrak{q}(b)\}$. We define a graph $\mathbf{H}$ on the vertex set $\mathcal{X}$ by setting $\mathbf{H} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{q}(\partial\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{B}})$ where we view $\partial\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{B}}$ as a set of undirected edges. We now extend the definition of $\mathfrak{q}$, also seeing it as a map $\mathfrak{q} : \mathbf{N}^{\partial\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{B}}} \to \mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{H}}$, by setting, for any $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{N}^{\partial E_{\mathcal{B}}}$, $\mathfrak{q}(\mathbf{j}) = \mathbf{n}$ where $\mathbf{n} = (n_e)_{e\in\mathbf{H}}$ with

$$n_e \overset{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} j_{(\circledast,\varrho_T)} & \text{if } e = \mathfrak{q}(e') \text{ with } e' \in \mathcal{E}_{\circledast}(T) \text{ for some } T \in \overline{\mathcal{B}} \\ j_{\mathfrak{q}^{-1}(e)} & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

We then set $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H},\lambda} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{q}(\partial\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{B},\lambda,\mathrm{tr}})$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H}} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{\lambda\in(0,1]} \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H},\lambda}$. We also introduce a slightly resummed family of kernels, for each $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H}}$ we define a function $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\lambda} \in \mathscr{C}_{\mathcal{X}}$ via

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{\mathbf{n}}_{\lambda} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{1}\{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H},\lambda}\} \sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathfrak{q}^{-1}(\mathbf{n})\cap\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{B},\lambda,\mathrm{tr}}} \mathring{\mathcal{W}}^{\mathbf{j}}_{\lambda}, \tag{8.48}$$

where $\mathring{\mathcal{W}}^{\mathbf{j}}_{\lambda}$ was defined in (8.5).

Remark 8.16 Note that for fixed $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H},\lambda}$ there is a uniform bound on the number of terms appearing in the above sum and that by Lemma 8.15 one has

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H}}} \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_\lambda^{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H},\lambda}} \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_\lambda^{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\partial\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{B},\lambda}} \mathring{\mathcal{W}}_\lambda^{\mathbf{j}} \,.$$

We now define a total homogeneity ς on the trees of $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{X}}$ by setting

$$\begin{aligned}\varsigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} &- \sum_{u\in\tilde{N}(\overline{T})} |\overline{\mathfrak{n}}(u)|_{\mathfrak{s}}\delta^{\uparrow}[\{\mathfrak{q}(u),\circledast\}] + \sum_{\substack{B\in\pi\\ B\subset L_{\mathcal{B}}(\overline{T})}} \mathfrak{c}^B + \sum_{T\in\overline{\mathcal{B}}} \omega(T)\delta^{\uparrow}[\varrho_T] \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{e\in\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{B}}(\overline{T})\sqcup K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{B}}(\overline{T})\\ e\notin\mathscr{S}}} \mathfrak{h}(e)\delta^{\uparrow}[\mathfrak{q}(e)^{\uparrow}] + \sum_{B\in R(\mathbf{T})} \mathfrak{f}(B)\Big(\delta^{\Uparrow}[B] - \delta^{\uparrow}[B]\Big) \\ &+ \sum_{e\in\mathscr{D}} \gamma(e)\Big(\delta^{\uparrow}[\mathfrak{q}(e)] - \delta^{\uparrow}[\{\circledast,\mathfrak{q}(e_{\mathrm{p}})\}]\Big) \\ &+ [\sum_{e\in\mathscr{S}} (\gamma(e)-1)\Big(\delta^{\uparrow}[\{e_{\mathrm{c}},\circledast\}] - \delta^{\uparrow}[\{\circledast,\mathfrak{q}(e_{\mathrm{p}})\}]\Big) + \mathfrak{h}(e)\delta^{\uparrow}[\{e_{\mathrm{c}},\circledast\}]],\end{aligned} \tag{8.49}$$

where $R(\mathbf{T}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \big\{B\in\pi:\ |B|=2,\ B\subset L_{\mathcal{B}}(\overline{T}),\ |\mathfrak{t}(B)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \geq |\mathfrak{s}| \text{ and } \mathbf{L}_{B^{\uparrow}} = B\big\}$.

We can then state the final lemma of this section.

Lemma 8.17 *If one defines ς as in* (8.49)*, then uniform in $\lambda \in (0,1]$, there exists a $F_\lambda \in \mathrm{Mod}_\ell(\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_\lambda)$ such that*

$$\|F_\lambda\|_{\varsigma,\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H}},\tilde{L}} \lesssim \lambda^{-|\mathfrak{s}|}\|K(\overline{T})\|_{\mathfrak{t}} \cdot \|\xi\|_{|L(\overline{T})\setminus\tilde{L}|} \,.$$

When we say this condition holds uniform in λ we are including uniformity in the combinatorial constant appearing in (A.5).

Proof. We set, for each $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H}}$,

$$F_\lambda^{\mathbf{n}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_\lambda^{\mathbf{n}} & \text{if } \mathbf{n}\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H},\lambda} \text{ and } R(\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{n})) = \emptyset \,, \\ \mathring{F}_\lambda^{\mathbf{n}} & \text{if } \mathbf{n}\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H},\lambda} \text{ and } R(\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{n})) \neq \emptyset \,, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We will define $\mathring{F}_\lambda^{\mathbf{n}}$ on a tree by tree basis later. It suffices to check the domain condition and desired supremum bounds in each of the three cases separately. For the first case one this is done by combining the definition in (8.48), Remark 8.16, all the lemmas of Section 8.3, and all the previous lemmas of this section.

For the second case we fix $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ with $R(\mathbf{T}) \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H},\lambda}$ with $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{n}) = \mathbf{T}$. We then set

$$\mathring{F}_\lambda^{\mathbf{n}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\mathbf{j}\in\mathfrak{q}^{-1}(\mathbf{n})\cap\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{B},\lambda,\mathrm{tr}}} \mathrm{Cu}_{\pi,\mathbf{n}}^{\hat{R}(\mathbf{T})} \cdot \Big(\prod_{B\in R(\mathbf{T})} (1-\mathscr{Y}_B)\Big)[\hat{G}_\lambda^{\mathbf{j}}] \,,$$

where we have written $\hat{R}(\mathbf{T}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{B \in R(\mathbf{T})} B$, the operators $\mathscr{Y}_B$ were defined in (8.8), and

$$\hat{G}_\lambda^{\mathbf{j}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \psi_{\mathbf{j}}^\lambda \cdot \mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{j}}^{\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{B}}(\overline{T})\setminus\mathscr{B}} \mathrm{Cu}_{\pi,\mathbf{n}}^{L_{\mathcal{B}}(\overline{T})\setminus\hat{R}(\mathbf{T})} \widetilde{\mathrm{RKer}}_{0,\mathbf{j}}^{\mathscr{B}\setminus K^\downarrow(\mathcal{B})} \mathrm{X}_{\bar{\mathfrak{n}},\circledast,\mathbf{j}}^{\tilde{N}_{\mathcal{B}}(\overline{T})}$$
$$\cdot \prod_{S \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}} \hat{H}_S^{\mathbf{j}} \Big[\widetilde{\mathrm{RKer}}_{0,\mathbf{j}}^{\mathscr{B}\cap K^\downarrow(S)} \mathrm{Ker}_{0,\mathbf{j}}^{K^\downarrow(S)\setminus\mathscr{B}} \mathrm{X}_{\bar{\mathfrak{n}},\mathbf{j},\circledast}^{\tilde{N}(S)} \Big].$$

An important observation is that the sets $\tilde{L}$ and $\bigcup_{B \in R(\mathbf{T})} B$ must be disjoint. Therefore one can use the same argument as in Lemma 8.25 to show that for any $x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\tilde{L}}$ one has

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}_0 \setminus \tilde{L}} dy \, \mathring{F}_\lambda^{\mathfrak{n}}(x \sqcup y) = \int_{\mathcal{X}_0 \setminus \tilde{L}} dy \, \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_\lambda^{\mathfrak{n}}(x \sqcup y).$$

The domain condition for $\mathring{F}_\lambda^{\mathfrak{n}}$ is also straightforward to check. The desired supremum bound for $\mathring{F}_\lambda^{\mathfrak{n}}$ follows by the same sort of Taylor remainder argument as in Lemma 8.25. For multi-indices m supported on $\tilde{L}$ one gets the desired supremum bounds for $D^m \mathring{F}_\lambda^{\mathfrak{n}}$ follow by the same argument - note that the operator D^m commutes with the $\mathscr{Y}_B$ and only acts on the $\hat{G}_\lambda^{\mathbf{j}}$. □

9 Moments of trees and proof of the main theorem

We now state the propositions which combined with Theorem A.23 establish the main theorem.

Proposition 9.1 *The total homogeneity ς given by* (8.49) *satisfies the conditions of Theorem A.23 with $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{X}_0$, $\mathbf{H}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H}}$ as given, $\circledast$ as the pinned vertex, $\mathbf{H}_* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\circledast, \varrho_*\}$, $\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\bar{T}_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}},0}| - |\mathfrak{t}(\tilde{L})|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |\mathfrak{s}|$, and $\ell \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{L}$ with its type map $\mathfrak{t}$.*

Proof. It is straightforward to check ς is of order $|\bar{T}_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}},0}| - |\mathfrak{t}(\tilde{L})|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |\mathfrak{s}|$. We split the verification of (A.13) and (A.14) into Lemma 9.2 and Lemma 9.3. □

Before stating and proving Lemma 9.2 and Lemma 9.3 we give introduce more notation and state an observation.

For any $u \in N(\overline{T})$ we write $\overline{T}_{\geq}(u)$ for the maximal subtree of $\overline{T}$ with true node set $\{v \in N(\overline{T}) : v \geq u\}$. Also, for any $M \subset N^*$ we write

$$M^{\text{cu}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (L(\overline{T}) \setminus \tilde{L}) \cap M, \; M^{\text{ext}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{L} \cap M,$$
$$K(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K(T(M)), \text{ and } K^\downarrow(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K^\downarrow(T(M)) .$$

Finally, an important observation we will use is that for any $K(\overline{T})$-connected subset $A \subset N(\overline{T})$ one has

$$|T(A)_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} + \sum_{e \in K^\downarrow(A)} |\tilde{P}[\overline{T}_{\geq}(e)_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}]|_{\mathfrak{s}} = |\overline{T}_{\geq}(\varrho_A)_{\mathfrak{e}}^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}|. \tag{9.1}$$

Lemma 9.2 *The total homogeneity ς, as defined by* (8.49)*, satisfies condition* (A.13) *of Theorem A.23.*

Proof. We define a map $\tilde{\varsigma} : 2^{N^*} \to \mathbf{R}$ as follows, for $M \subset N^*$ we set

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\varsigma}(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} &- (|M| - 1)|\mathfrak{s}| + \sum_{\substack{e \in K(\overline{T}) \setminus \mathscr{S} \\ e_{\mathrm{c}} \subset M}} \mathfrak{h}(e) \\ &- \mathbb{1}\{\circledast \in M\} \left[|\overline{\mathfrak{n}}(M \setminus \{\circledast\})|_{\mathfrak{s}} + \sum_{e \in \mathscr{D}} \gamma(e) \mathbb{1}\left\{ \begin{array}{l} e_{\mathrm{c}} \notin M \\ e_{\mathrm{p}} \in M \end{array} \right\} \right] \\ &+ \mathbb{1}\{\circledast \in M\} \sum_{e \in \mathscr{S}} \big[\mathfrak{h}(e) + (\gamma_e - 1) \mathbb{1}\{e_{\mathrm{p}} \notin M\} \big] \mathbb{1}\{e_{\mathrm{c}} \in M\} \\ &- \sum_{\substack{B \in \pi \\ B \subset M^{\mathrm{cu}}}} |\mathfrak{t}(B)|_{\mathfrak{s}} - \sum_{\substack{B \in \pi \\ B \not\subset M^{\mathrm{cu}}}} |\mathfrak{t}(B \cap M^{\mathrm{cu}})|_{\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{c}} + \sum_{\substack{B \in \pi \\ M = B}} \mathscr{\ell}(B)\end{aligned} \tag{9.2}$$

We fix, for the remainder of this proof, $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$. We define

$$\mathbf{N}(a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{L}_a \sqcup \Big(\bigsqcup_{\substack{T \in C_{\mathcal{B}}(\overline{T}) \\ \varrho_T \in \mathbf{L}_a}} \tilde{N}(T) \Big), \tag{9.3}$$

and also set $\mathcal{Q} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big\{ \mathbf{N}(a) : \ a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}} \setminus \{\varrho_{\mathbf{T}}\} \Big\}$.

We claim that for any $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}$,

$$\Big(\sum_{b \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}_{\geq a}} \varsigma(b) \Big) - (|\mathbf{L}_a| - 1)|\mathfrak{s}| \leq \tilde{\varsigma}(\mathbf{N}(a)) \, .$$

The above equality is not hard to check once one observes that for $M \in \mathcal{Q}$

1. $e \in \mathscr{S}$ and $e_{\mathrm{p}}, \circledast \in M$ together imply $e_{\mathrm{c}} \in M$.
2. $e \in \mathscr{D}$ and $e_{\mathrm{c}}, e_{\mathrm{p}} \in M$ together imply $\circledast \in M$.

We can then reformulate the statement of the lemma as follows: for all $M \in \mathcal{Q}$ one has

$$\tilde{\varsigma}(M) < |\mathfrak{t}(M^{\mathrm{ext}})|_{\mathfrak{s}} + \mathbb{1}\{M \not\ni \circledast\} (\min_{\mathfrak{t}' \in \mathfrak{t}_-} |\mathfrak{t}'|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |\mathfrak{s}|) \vee \hbar_{\mathfrak{c}}(M^{\mathrm{ext}}), \tag{9.4}$$

where $\hbar_{\mathfrak{c}}(\cdot)$ is defined as in (A.12). In the case where $\circledast \notin M$ and $M^{\mathrm{ext}} = \emptyset$ the bound can be proven by copying the argument of Lemma 8.12 nearly verbatim. Therefore we restrict ourselves to the cases of $M \in \mathcal{Q}$ with either $\circledast \in M$ or $M^{\mathrm{ext}} \neq \emptyset$.

For these cases it is convenient to prove a stronger bound than (9.4). To state this bound we define another function $\hat{\varsigma} : 2^{N^*} \to \mathbf{R}$ by using the same definition for $\tilde{\varsigma}$ as in (9.2) but replacing the entire last line of (9.2) with $-|\mathfrak{t}(M^{\mathrm{cu}} \sqcup M^{\mathrm{ext}})|_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

We finish the proof of the lemma by proving for any $M \subset N^*$ satisfying either: (i) $M \in \mathcal{Q}$, $M \not\ni \circledast$, and $M^{\text{ext}} \neq \emptyset$, or (ii) $M \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $M \ni \circledast$, one has

$$\hat{\varsigma}(M) < \mathbb{1}\{M \not\ni \circledast\}(\min_{\mathfrak{t}' \in \mathfrak{t}_-} |\mathfrak{t}'|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |\mathfrak{s}|) \vee \hbar_{\mathfrak{c}}(M^{\text{ext}}). \tag{9.5}$$

We first establish (9.5) in situation (i). Since the RHS of this inequality is then non-negative is suffices to show $\hat{\varsigma}(M) < 0$ for all such M. In what follows we make frequent and implicit use of Assumption 2.17.

We start with the subcase where $|M| = 2$ - one has $\hat{\zeta}(M) < 0$ unless $M \subset L(\overline{T})$. In this latter situation, writing $\mathfrak{t}_1$ and $\mathfrak{t}_2$ for the types of the two leave edges of $M^{\text{cu}} \sqcup M^{\text{ext}}$, one has $\hat{\varsigma}(M) = -|\mathfrak{t}_1|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{t}_2|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{s}|$. There exists $\kappa > 0$ such that the RHS of (9.5) is bounded below by minimum of $|\mathfrak{s}| + |\mathfrak{t}_1|_{\mathfrak{s}}$, $-|\mathfrak{s}| + \kappa - |\mathfrak{t}_1|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{t}_2|_{\mathfrak{s}}$, and $|\mathfrak{t}_1|_{\mathfrak{s}} \wedge |\mathfrak{t}_2|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ (we get the second quantity thanks to Definition A.13). It is immediate that $\hat{\varsigma}(M)$ is strictly bounded above by each of these quantities. This finishes the subcase $|M| = 2$.

The subcase where $M \subset L(\overline{T})$ and $|M| > 2$ is immediate since $\hat{\varsigma}(M)$ satisfies the same bound as $\tilde{\varsigma}$ does in (8.40) and so is strictly negative.

Now suppose that $M \not\subset L(\overline{T})$ and M consists of more than one $K(\overline{T})$-component. We then have a decomposition of M as in (8.41) with the same properties. The same arguments used in Lemma 8.12 can be used here to show that one always has $\hat{\varsigma}(M) < 0$ in the disconnected case.

What is left for case (i) is to establish (9.5) for any $K(\overline{T})$-connected $M \subset N(\overline{T})$ with $M^{\text{ext}} \neq \emptyset$, $M \not\ni \circledast$, and $|M| > 2$ - this is an immediate consequence of the inequality $\hat{\varsigma}(M) \leq -|T(M)^0_{\mathfrak{c}}|_{\mathfrak{s}}$, Definition A.18 and item 3 of Definition 2.18.

Now we turn to case (ii). Let $M \in \mathcal{Q}$ with $M \ni \circledast$, writing $\{M_j\}_{j=1}^n$ for the $K(\overline{T})$ connected components of $M \setminus \{\circledast\}$ it is straightforward to see that

$$\hat{\varsigma}(M) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \hat{\varsigma}(M_j \sqcup \{\circledast\})$$

so it suffices to prove $\hat{\varsigma}(\widehat{M} \sqcup \{\circledast\}) < 0$ for all $\widehat{M} \in \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}$ where we have defined

$$\widehat{\mathcal{Q}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \widehat{M} \subset N(\overline{T}) : \begin{array}{c} \widehat{M} \text{ is } K(\overline{T}) - \text{connected and } \exists\, M \in \mathcal{Q},\ \grave{u} \in \mathcal{X}_0 \\ \text{such that } M \ni \circledast \text{ and } \widehat{M} = \overline{T}_{\geq}(u) \cap M \end{array} \right\}.$$

Observe that for any $\widehat{M} \in \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}$ and $S \in \mathcal{B}$ one has $N(S) \subset \widehat{M}$ or $N(S) \cap \widehat{M} = \emptyset$. A second important observation is that for any $\widehat{M} \in \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}$ one has

$$\sum_{e \in K^{\downarrow}(\widehat{M})} |\tilde{P}[\overline{T}_{\geq}(e)^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{c}}]|_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq \sum_{e \in \mathscr{D} \cap K^{\downarrow}(\widehat{M})} \gamma(e) \tag{9.6}$$

because (i) the conditions $e \in K^{\downarrow}(\widehat{M})$ and $|\tilde{P}[\overline{T}_{\geq}(e)^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{c}}]|_{\mathfrak{s}} > 0$ together force $e \in \mathscr{D}$ and (ii) the definition of $\gamma(e)$.

The claim we will prove, which will finish the proof of this lemma, is that for every $\widehat{M} \in \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}$

$$\hat{\varsigma}(\widehat{M} \sqcup \{\circledast\}) \leq \begin{cases} -|\mathfrak{s}| - |\overline{T}_{\geq}(\varrho_{\widehat{M}})^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} & \text{if } \varrho_{\widehat{M}} \notin e_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathscr{S}) \\ -\mathrm{frac}(|\tilde{P}[\overline{T}_{\geq}(\tilde{e})^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}]|_{\mathfrak{s}}) & \text{if } \varrho_{\widehat{M}} = \tilde{e}_{\mathrm{c}} \text{ for } \tilde{e} \in \mathscr{S}, \end{cases} \tag{9.7}$$

where for $t \geq 0$ we define $\mathrm{frac}(t) = t - \lfloor t \rfloor$. Note that in the second case of the RHS such an edge $\tilde{e}$ is necessarily unique, this makes the formula well-defined. We prove (9.7) inductively with respect to the cardinality of $\widehat{M} \cap \mathcal{X}_0$.

We start with the base case where $|\widehat{M} \cap \mathcal{X}_0| = 1$ - here there are no edges $e \in \mathscr{S}$ with $e \subset \widehat{M}$ and the LHS of (9.7) is equal to

$$\begin{cases} -|\mathfrak{s}| - |T(\widehat{M})^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} - \displaystyle\sum_{e \in \mathscr{D} \cap K^{\downarrow}(\widehat{M})} \gamma(e) & \text{if } \varrho_{\widehat{M}} \notin e_{\mathrm{c}}^{-1}(\mathscr{S}), \\ -|T(\widehat{M})^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} + (\mathfrak{h}(\tilde{e}) - |\mathfrak{s}|) + \gamma(\tilde{e}) - 1 - \displaystyle\sum_{e \in \mathscr{D} \cap K^{\downarrow}(\widehat{M})} \gamma(e) & \text{if } \tilde{e} \in \mathscr{S},\ \varrho_{\widehat{M}} = \tilde{e}_{\mathrm{c}}\ . \end{cases} \tag{9.8}$$

Now let us verify that (9.8) implies (9.7). When $\varrho_{\widehat{M}} \notin e_{\mathrm{c}}^{-1}(\mathscr{S})$ this follows from (9.6), when $\varrho_{\widehat{M}} = \tilde{e}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ones uses (9.1) and (9.6) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(\tilde{e}) - 1 &= |\tilde{P}[\overline{T}_{\geq}(\tilde{e})^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}]|_{\mathfrak{s}} - \mathrm{frac}(|\tilde{P}[\overline{T}_{\geq}(\tilde{e})^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}]|_{\mathfrak{s}}) \\ &= (|\mathfrak{s}| - \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{e})) + |\overline{T}_{\geq}(\varrho_{\widehat{M}})^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} - \mathrm{frac}(|\tilde{P}[\overline{T}_{\geq}(\tilde{e})^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}]|_{\mathfrak{s}}) \\ &= (|\mathfrak{s}| - \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{e})) + |T(\widehat{M})^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} + \sum_{e \in K^{\downarrow}(\widehat{M})} |\tilde{P}[\overline{T}_{\geq}(e)^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}]|_{\mathfrak{s}} - \mathrm{frac}(|\tilde{P}[\bar{T}_{\geq}(\tilde{e})^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}]|) \\ &\leq (|\mathfrak{s}| - \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{e})) + |T(\widehat{M})^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} + \sum_{e \in \mathscr{D} \cap K^{\downarrow}(\widehat{M})} \gamma(e) - \mathrm{frac}(|\tilde{P}[\bar{T}_{\geq}(\tilde{e})^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}]|)\ . \end{aligned} \tag{9.9}$$

We now turn to the inductive step. We fix $q \geq 2$ and assume that (9.7) holds for all elements of $\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}$ whose intersection with $\mathcal{X}_0$ is of cardinality strictly less than q. Suppose that we are given $\widehat{M} \in \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}$ with $|\widehat{M} \cap \mathcal{X}_0| = q$.

We first define

$$\overline{M} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} N(S) & \text{if } \varrho_{\widehat{M}} = \varrho_S, \text{ for some } S \in \overline{\mathcal{B}} \\ \{\varrho_{\widehat{M}}\} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$K^{\downarrow}_{\varrho,\mathrm{int}}(\widehat{M}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K^{\downarrow}(\overline{M}) \cap K(\widehat{M}), \text{ and } K^{\downarrow}_{\varrho,\mathrm{ext}}(\widehat{M}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K^{\downarrow}(\overline{M}) \setminus K(\widehat{M})\ .$$

Next, we decompose $\widehat{M} \setminus \overline{M}$ into $K(\overline{T})$-connected components $\{\widehat{M}_j\}_{j=1}^n$, then the LHS of (9.7) is then equal to

$$-|T(\overline{M})^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{s}| + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left[\hat{\varsigma}(\widehat{M}_j \sqcup \{\circledast\}) - |\mathfrak{t}(\widehat{M}_j^{\mathrm{ext}})|_{\mathfrak{s}}\right] \tag{9.10}$$

$$+ \sum_{e \in K^{\downarrow}_{\varrho,\mathrm{int}}(\widehat{M})} \Big[\mathbb{1}\{e \notin \mathscr{S}\}\mathfrak{h}(e) - \mathbb{1}\{e \in \mathscr{S}\}(\gamma(e)-1) \Big]$$
$$- \sum_{e \in K^{\downarrow}_{\varrho,\mathrm{ext}}(\widehat{M})} \mathbb{1}\{e \in \mathscr{D}\}\gamma(e) + \mathbb{1}\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \varrho_{\widehat{M}} = \tilde{e}_{\mathrm{c}} \\ \text{for } \tilde{e} \in \mathscr{S} \end{array} \right\} [\mathfrak{h}(\tilde{e}) + (\gamma(\tilde{e})-1)]$$

Note that the two summation sets appearing in the first two sets are in bijection where one assigns each $\widehat{M}_j$ to the unique e with $e_{\mathrm{c}} = \varrho_{\widehat{M}_j}$.

For each j, $\widehat{M}_j \in \widehat{\mathcal{Q}}$ and $|\widehat{M}_j \cap \mathcal{X}_0| < q$ - thus using our inductive hypothesis combined with (9.9) gives

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \hat{\varsigma}(\widehat{M}_j \sqcup \{\circledast\}) + \sum_{e \in K^{\downarrow}_{\varrho,\mathrm{int}}(\widehat{M})} \Big[\mathbb{1}\{e \notin \mathscr{S}\}\mathfrak{h}(e) - \mathbb{1}\{e \in \mathscr{S}\}(\gamma(e)-1) \Big] \quad (9.11)$$
$$\leq - \sum_{e \in K^{\downarrow}_{\varrho,\mathrm{int}}(\widehat{M})} \mathbb{1}\{e \notin \mathscr{S}\} \Big(|\bar{T}_{\geq}(e_{\mathrm{c}})^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |\mathfrak{s}| - \mathfrak{h}(e) \Big) + \mathbb{1}\{e \in \mathscr{S}\} |\tilde{P}[\overline{T}_{\geq}(e)^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}]|_{\mathfrak{s}}$$
$$= \sum_{e \in K^{\downarrow}_{\varrho,\mathrm{int}}(\widehat{M})} |\tilde{P}[\bar{T}_{\geq}(e)^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}]|_{\mathfrak{s}} \ .$$

On the other hand,

$$- \sum_{e \in K^{\downarrow}_{\varrho,\mathrm{ext}}(\widehat{M})} \mathbb{1}\{e \in \mathscr{D}\}\gamma(e) \leq - \sum_{e \in K^{\downarrow}_{\varrho,\mathrm{ext}}(\widehat{M})} |\tilde{P}[\bar{T}_{\geq}(e)^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}]|_{\mathfrak{s}} \ . \quad (9.12)$$

By using (9.11) and (9.12) in (9.10) we see $\hat{\varsigma}(\widehat{M} \sqcup \{\circledast\})$ is bounded above by

$$- |T(\overline{M})^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{s}| + \mathbb{1}\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \varrho_{\widehat{M}} = \tilde{e}_{\mathrm{c}} \\ \text{for } \tilde{e} \in \mathscr{S} \end{array} \right\} [\mathfrak{h}(\tilde{e}) + \gamma(\tilde{e}) - 1] - \sum_{e \in K^{\downarrow}(\overline{M})} |\tilde{P}[\bar{T}_{\geq}(e)^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}]|_{\mathfrak{s}}$$
$$= -|\overline{T}_{\geq}(\varrho_{\widehat{M}})^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{s}| + \mathbb{1}\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \varrho_{\widehat{M}} = \tilde{e}_{\mathrm{c}} \\ \text{for } \tilde{e} \in \mathscr{S} \end{array} \right\} [\mathfrak{h}(\tilde{e}) + \gamma(\tilde{e}) - 1].$$

This is the desired bound when $\varrho_{\widehat{M}} \notin e_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathscr{S})$. It is also the desired bound when the indicator function is non-vanishing since in this case

$$- |\overline{T}_{\geq}(\varrho_{\widehat{M}})^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{s}| + \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{e}) = |\tilde{P}[\overline{T}_{\geq}(\tilde{e})^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}]|_{\mathfrak{s}}$$
$$\text{and } \ \gamma(\tilde{e}) - 1 = |\tilde{P}[\overline{T}_{\geq}(\tilde{e})^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}]|_{\mathfrak{s}} - \mathrm{frac}\{|\tilde{P}[\overline{T}_{\geq}(\tilde{e})^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\mathfrak{e}}]|_{\mathfrak{s}}\} \ .$$

□

Lemma 9.3 *The total homogeneity ς, as defined by* (8.49)*, satisifies condition 4 of Theorem A.23.*

Proof. We start by defining map $\tilde{\varsigma} : 2^{\tilde{N}(\overline{T})} \to \mathbf{R}$ as follows, for $M \subset N^*$ we set

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\varsigma}(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} & \sum_{\substack{e \in K(\overline{T}) \setminus \mathscr{S} \\ e \cap M \neq \emptyset}} \mathfrak{h}(e) - |\mathfrak{t}(M^{\text{cu}})|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{t}(M^{\text{ext}}) + \sum_{e \in \mathscr{D}} \mathbb{1}\left\{ \begin{array}{c} e_{\text{c}} \in M \\ e_{\text{p}} \notin M \end{array} \right\} \gamma(e) \\ & + \Big[\sum_{e \in \mathscr{S}} \mathfrak{h}(e) \mathbb{1}\{e_{\text{c}} \in M\} - (\gamma(e) - 1) \mathbb{1}\left\{ \begin{array}{c} e_{\text{p}} \in M \\ e_{\text{c}} \notin M \end{array} \right\} \Big] \\ & - |\overline{\mathfrak{n}}(M)|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |M|\,|\mathfrak{s}|.\end{aligned} \tag{9.13}$$

Fix for the remainder of the proof fix $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$. $M \in \mathcal{Q}$.

We claim that for $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}$ with $a \leq \{\circledast, \varrho_*\}^{\uparrow}$ one has, writing $M \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} N^* \setminus \mathbf{N}(a)$ (where $\mathbf{N}(a)$ is defined as in (9.3)),

$$\sum_{b \in (T)_{\not\geq a}} \varsigma(b) - |\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathbf{L}_a|\,|\mathfrak{s}| - |\mathfrak{t}(M^{\text{ext}}) \geq \tilde{\varsigma}(M)$$

The claim is easily justified upon remembering that $e \in \mathfrak{C}$, $e_{\mathfrak{c}} \in N^* \setminus \mathbf{N}(a)$ and $e_{\text{p}} \notin N^* \setminus \mathbf{N}(a)$ together imply $e \in \mathscr{D}$ and that one has, using item 3 of Definition A.13, the inequality

$$\sum_{b \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}_{\not\geq a}} \sum_{B \in \pi} \mathfrak{c}^B(b) \geq |\mathfrak{t}(M^{\text{cu}})|_{\mathfrak{s}}\,.$$

We now define a collection of node sets $\mathcal{Z} \subset 2^{\tilde{N}(\overline{T})}$ by setting

$$\mathcal{Z} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ M \subset \tilde{N}(\overline{T}) : \begin{array}{c} \exists a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}} \text{ with } a \leq \circledast \text{ and } a \leq \varrho_* \text{ such that} \\ M \text{ is an } K(\overline{T})\text{-connected component of } N(a)^c \end{array} \right\}.$$

The lemma will be proved if we show that for every $M \in \mathcal{Z}$, $\tilde{\varsigma}(M) > 0$, here we used that if $M \subset \tilde{N}(\overline{T})$ decomposes into $K(\overline{T})$-components $\{M_j\}_{j=1}^n$ then $\tilde{\varsigma}(M) = \sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{\varsigma}(M_j)$.

We now fix $M \in \mathcal{Z}$ and write $\tilde{e}$ for the unique edge in $e \in K(\overline{T})$ with $\tilde{e}_{\mathfrak{c}} = \varrho_M$. We start by observing that $\tilde{e} \in \mathfrak{C} \Rightarrow \tilde{e} \in \mathscr{D}$, and $\tilde{e}$ is the only edge that could possibly contribute to the sum occurring in the last term of the first line of (9.13).

The proof of the lemma is finished upon proving the claim

$$\tilde{\varsigma}(M) \geq -|\tilde{P}[\bar{T}_{\geq}(\tilde{e})]_{\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}}^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} + \gamma(\tilde{e}) \cdot \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{e} \in \mathfrak{C}\} > 0. \tag{9.14}$$

The last inequality of (9.14) is a consequence of the definition of $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\gamma(\cdot)$.

We now prove the first inequality of (9.14). First observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\varsigma}(M) = & - |T(M)_{\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}}^{\overline{\mathfrak{n}}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} + \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{e}) - |\mathfrak{s}| + \gamma(\tilde{e}) \cdot \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{e} \in \mathfrak{C}\} \\ & + \sum_{e \in K^{\downarrow}(M) \setminus \mathscr{S}} \mathfrak{h}(e) - \sum_{e \in K^{\downarrow}(M) \cap \mathscr{S}} (\gamma(e) - 1)\end{aligned} \tag{9.15}$$

Conversely, by using (9.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned} -|\tilde{P}[\overline{T}_{\geq}(\tilde{e})]^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} &= -|\overline{T}_{\geq}(\varrho_M)^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} + \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{e}) - |\mathfrak{s}| \\ &= -|T(M)^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} + \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{e}) - |\mathfrak{s}| - \sum_{e \in K^{\downarrow}(M)} |\tilde{P}[\overline{T}_{\geq}(e)]^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} \, . \end{aligned} \tag{9.16}$$

The claim is then proved upon observing that

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall e \in K^{\downarrow}(M) \setminus \mathscr{S}, \ |\tilde{P}[\overline{T}_{\geq}(e)]^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} > -\mathfrak{h}(e) \\ \text{and } &\forall e \in K^{\downarrow}(M) \cap \mathscr{S}, \ |\tilde{P}[\overline{T}_{\geq}(e)]^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} > (\gamma(e) - 1) \, . \end{aligned} \tag{9.17}$$

The second inequality of (9.17) follows from the definition of $\gamma(\cdot)$ (and holds for all $e \in \mathfrak{C}$). The first inequality of (9.17) actually holds for all $e \in K(\overline{T})$ - one writes

$$|\tilde{P}[\overline{T}_{\geq}(e)]^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} = \Big(|\overline{T}_{\geq}(e_{\mathrm{c}})^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |\mathfrak{s}| \Big) - \mathfrak{h}(e)$$

and then notices that the quantity in parentheses on the RHS must be strictly positive by either item 1 of Definition 2.18 or Assumption 2.17. Using (9.17) in (9.16) and then using (9.15) gives the first inequality of (9.14) as required. □

We now describe how everything fits together to prove Theorem 2.20.

Proof Proposition 8.2. Here we combine the outputs of Lemma 8.17 with Proposition 9.1 as input to Theorem A.23 - the desired bound is obtained from (A.15) and setting $r \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\lfloor \log_2(\lambda) \rfloor$. □

Proof Theorem 2.20. Note that the sums over $\tilde{L} \subset L(\overline{T})$, $\pi \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}[L(\overline{T}) \setminus \tilde{L}]$, and $(\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{G}) \in \mathfrak{R}$ are all finite and therefore contribute only combinatorial factors - it follows that the estimate of Proposition 8.2 combined with the identifications of Lemma 4.23 and Proposition 4.22 gives one (2.10) of Theorem 2.20.

We now describe how a simple modification of our analysis gives (2.11). By stationarity, it suffices to prove the bound for $z = 0$. Next, observe that $X^{\xi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \hat{\Upsilon}^{\xi}_0[\overline{T}^{\bar{\mathfrak{n}}}_{\bar{\mathfrak{e}}}](\psi^{\lambda}_0)$, seen as a function of $\xi \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_\infty)$ is in fact a $|L(\overline{T})|$-linear function of ξ.

Now we write, for $\xi, \bar{\xi} \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_\infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[(X^{\xi} - X^{\bar{\xi}})^{2p}] &= \sum_{j=0}^{2p} (-1)^{2p-j} \binom{2p}{j} \mathbf{E}[(X^{\xi})^j (X^{\bar{\xi}})^{2p-j}] \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{2p} (-1)^{2p-j} \binom{2p}{j} \mathbf{E}[(X^{\xi})^j (X^{\bar{\xi}})^{2p-j} - (X^{\xi})^{2p}] \, . \end{aligned}$$

We will estimate the above sum term by term. Fixing j, note the we are estimating can be written as the difference of a single $2p|L(\overline{T})|$-linear functional on $\mathcal{M}(\Omega_\infty)$

evaluated at two different sets of arguments. Denoting this functional by $\mathfrak{X}$ and choosing a convenient ordering for its arguments we then write

$$\begin{aligned}
&(X^\xi)^j (X^{\bar\xi})^{2p-j} - (X^\xi)^{2p} \\
&= \mathfrak{X}(\xi^{\otimes j|L(\overline{T})|} \otimes \bar\xi^{\otimes(2p-j)|L(\overline{T})|}) - \mathfrak{X}(\xi^{\otimes 2p|L(\overline{T})|}) \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{(2p-j)|L(\overline{T})|-1} \mathfrak{X}(\xi^{\otimes j|L(\overline{T})|+k} \otimes (\bar\xi - \xi) \otimes \bar\xi^{\otimes(2p-j)|L(\overline{T})|-k-1}) \,.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, by performing the same analysis as used for the uniform bound, one obtains, for each fixed k in the above sum,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\mathbf{E}[\mathfrak{X}(\xi^{\otimes j|L(\overline{T})|+k} \otimes (\xi - \bar\xi) \otimes \bar\xi^{\otimes(2p-j)|L(\overline{T})|-k-1})]\Big| \\
&\lesssim \Big(\prod_{e\in K(T)} \|K_{\mathfrak{t}(e)}\|_{|\mathfrak{t}(e)|_{\mathfrak{s}},m}\Big)^{2p} (\|\xi\|_{j,\mathfrak{c}} \vee \|\bar\xi\|_{j,\mathfrak{c}}) \|\xi;\bar\xi\|_{j,\mathfrak{c}} \lambda^{2p|\tau|_{\mathfrak{s}}} \,.
\end{aligned}$$

The factor of $\|\xi;\bar\xi\|_{j,\mathfrak{c}}$ is obtained because at least one of the cumulants appearing in our estimates will involve the difference $\xi - \bar\xi$. □

Appendix A Multiscale Clustering

A.1 Multiscale clustering for a single tree

Suppose we are given a undirected connected graph $\mathbf{G}$ (here a graph is a collection of undirected edges) with vertex set $\mathcal{V} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{v_0, \dots, v_p\}$ with $p \geq 1$. We consider v_0 to be the "root" of $\mathbf{G}$. We also write $\mathcal{V}_0 = \mathcal{V} \setminus \{v_0\}$.

Definition A.1 A *coalescence tree* $\mathbf{T}$ on a vertex set $\mathcal{V}$ is a rooted tree with at least three nodes with the following structures and properties:

- The set of leaves of $\mathbf{T}$ is identified with the set $\mathcal{V}$.
- Writing $\mathring{\mathbf{T}}$ for the set of internal nodes (i.e. nodes that are not leaves) and $\varrho_{\mathbf{T}}$ for the root of $\mathbf{T}$, we require that every $u \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}} \setminus \varrho_{\mathbf{T}}$ has degree at least 3 and that $\varrho_{\mathbf{T}}$ has degree at least 2.

We then also equip the set of nodes of $\mathbf{T}$ with the poset structure corresponding to viewing $\mathbf{T}$ has a Hasse diagram with its root $\varrho_{\mathbf{T}}$ as the unique minimal element.

Note that unlike in [HQ15] these coalescence trees are not necessarily binary, an internal node is allowed to have more than 2 "children". We denote by $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{V}}$ the (finite) set of *all* coalescence trees $\mathbf{T}$ on the vertex set $\mathcal{V}$.

The trees $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{V}}$ will be used to organize our multiscale expansions, for each fixed x_{v_0} they slice the domain $(\mathbf{R}^d)^{\mathcal{V}_0}$ into regions characterized by the relative distances of the variables $x_{\mathcal{V}} = (x_v)_{v\in\mathcal{V}}$. These domains can be visualized in the following way. For each fixed $x_{\mathcal{V}}$, define a family of equivalence relations $\{\sim_n\}_{n\in\mathbf{N}}$ on the set $\mathcal{V}$ by taking $\sim_n$ to be the transitive closure of the relation R_n given by

$$v R_n v' \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \{v, v'\} \in \mathbf{G} \text{ and } |x_v - x_{v'}| \leq 2^{-n} \,.$$

The tree $\mathbf{T}$ should then be thought of as pictorially representing one particular way the equivalence classes of the equivalence relations $\sim_n$ could merge as one takes n from $-\infty$ to 0 - if one ignores issues of coinciding position variables then at some value of n all the elements of $\mathcal{V}$ are singletons and by $n = 0$ there is only one equivalence class. The domain associated to a tree $\mathbf{T}$ would then correspond to all values of $x_{\mathcal{V}_0}$ for which the "coalescence history" prescribed by $\mathbf{T}$ holds.

The description above is only for intuition, concrete definitions are given below. However one can already see that it is natural to label the inner nodes of $\mathbf{T}$ with numbers that indicate the specific scale at which a coalescence event takes place.

Definition A.2 Given a vertex set $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}}$, we define $\mathrm{Lab}_{\mathbf{T}}$ to be the collection of all maps $\mathbf{s} : \mathring{T} \to \mathbf{N}$ with the property that $u < v \Rightarrow \mathbf{s}(u) < \mathbf{s}(v)$. The pair $(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{s})$ is then called a *labeled coalescence tree*.

Our multiscale expansion will be indexed by *scale assignments* $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{G}}$. We write an individual element of $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}$ as $\mathbf{n} = (n_e)_{e \in G}$. For any fixed $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{G}}$ and $r \in \mathbf{N}$ we define the subgraph $\mathbf{G}_r^{\mathbf{n}} = \{e \in \mathbf{G} : \ n_e \geq r\}$ and also define $\mathcal{V}_r^{\mathbf{n}} \subset 2^{\mathcal{V}}$ to be the collection of vertex sets of the connected components of $\mathbf{G}_r^{\mathbf{n}}$. We consider singletons as connected components so that, for every r, $\mathbf{G}_r^{\mathbf{n}}$ is a partition of $\mathcal{V}$.

The sequence $(\mathcal{V}_r^{\mathbf{n}})_{r \in \mathbf{N}}$ determines a labelled coalescence tree $(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{s})$ via the following procedure. The set of nodes for $\mathbf{T}$ is given by $\mathbf{T} = \bigcup_{r=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{V}_r^{\mathbf{n}}$. Since elements of $\mathbf{T}$ are themselves subsets of $\mathcal{V}$, they are partially ordered by inclusion. Given two distinct nodes $a, b \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}$ we then connect a and b if $a \subset b$ maximally in $\mathbf{T}$. In this way, the set of leaves is indeed given by $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathbf{T}$ since, for r sufficiently large, $\mathcal{V}_r^{\mathbf{n}}$ consists purely of singletons. The root is always given by $\varrho_{\mathbf{T}} = \mathcal{V}$, by considering r sufficiently small. It is easy to verify that the required properties hold for $\mathbf{T}$ as a consequence of the fact that the children of any node, viewed as subsets of $\mathcal{V}$, form a non-trivial partition of that node. The labeling $\mathbf{s}(\cdot)$ on internal nodes is defined as follows. For each $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}$, we set

$$\mathbf{s}(a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{r \in \mathbf{N} : \ a \in \mathcal{V}_r^{\mathbf{n}}\} \ .$$

This is always finite since elements of $\mathring{\mathbf{T}}$ are not singletons, while there always exists some r such that $\mathcal{V}_r^{\mathbf{n}} = \{\{v\} : v \in \mathcal{V}\}$. This completes our construction of the labeled coalescence tree $(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{s})$ with the caveat that for purely aesthetic reasons we identify the "singleton" leaves of $\mathbf{T}$ with their lone constituent element. We will henceforth always treat the elements of $\mathring{\mathbf{T}}$ as "abstract" nodes, once we are done constructing the tree we forget how they correspond to non-singleton subsets of $\mathcal{V}$.

The above procedure gives us a map $\hat{\mathcal{T}} : \mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{G}} \to \hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{V}} \ltimes \mathrm{Lab}_{\bullet}$ taking scale assignments to labeled coalescence trees, we write it $\mathbf{n} \mapsto (\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{n}), \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{n}))$. We then define $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}} = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}})$. Note that while it is suppressed from the notation, the usage of the notation $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}}$ instead of $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{V}}$ indicates that we have previously fixed a corresponding set of scales $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}$.

Given $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}}$ and $f \subset \mathcal{V}$ we write $f^{\uparrow}$ for the maximal internal node which is a *proper* ancestor of all the elements of f. When $f = \{a\}$ we may write $a^{\uparrow}$ instead

of $\{a\}^{\uparrow}$. We define $f^{\Uparrow}$ to be the maximal internal node which is a proper ancestor of $f^{\uparrow}$ if $f^{\uparrow} \neq \varrho_{\mathbf{T}}$, otherwise we set $f^{\Uparrow} = f^{\uparrow} = \varrho_{\mathbf{T}}$. For $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}$ we write $\mathbf{L}_a$ for the set of leaves of $\mathbf{T}$ which are descendants of a.

Let us give a concrete example to clarify these definitions. For our vertex set we fix $\mathcal{V} = \{v_0, \dots, v_6\}$. Below we fix a graph $\mathbf{G}$ by presenting it pictorially and also specify a scale assignment $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{G}}$ by labeling each of the edges.



Below we draw the corresponding coalescence tree $\mathbf{T} = \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{n})$, labeling the leaves using the set $\mathcal{V}$ and introducing new labels for the internal nodes of $\mathbf{T}$.



The labeling $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{n}) \in \mathrm{Lab}_{\mathbf{T}}$ is then given by

$u \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}$	a	b	c	d	e
$\mathbf{s}(u)$	500	187	80	7	25

In this example, we have

$$\{v_2, v_5\}^{\uparrow} = \{v_5\}^{\uparrow} = b\,, \quad \{v_2, v_5\}^{\Uparrow} = d\,, \quad \{v_1, v_3, v_5\}^{\Uparrow} = \{v_1, v_3, v_5\}^{\uparrow} = d\,.$$

We also define, for any $(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}} \ltimes \mathrm{Lab}_{\bullet}$, $\mathcal{N}_{\text{tri}}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{s}) \subset \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}$ to be the set of all those scale assignments $\mathbf{n}$ with $\hat{\mathcal{T}}(\mathbf{n}) = (\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{s})$ and the property that for every $e \in \mathbf{G}$

$$|n_e - \mathbf{s}(e^{\uparrow})| < 2C \cdot |\mathcal{V}|,$$

where here $C > 0$ is chosen to be the same as (A.1). Clearly $|\mathcal{N}_{\text{tri}}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{s})|$ is finite and bounded uniform in $(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}} \ltimes \mathrm{Lab}_{\bullet}$.

For each $(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}} \ltimes \mathbf{S}_{\bullet}$ we define

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{s}, x_{v_0}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\mathcal{V}_0} : \forall e = \{v_i, v_j\} \in \mathcal{V}^{(2)}, x_{v_i} \xleftrightarrow{\mathbf{s}(e^{\uparrow})} x_{v_j}\}, \qquad \text{(A.1)}$$

where we've used the notation (8.12).

Definition A.3 For $\mathbf{T} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{V}}$ we call a map $\varsigma_{\mathbf{T}} : \mathring{\mathbf{T}} \to \mathbf{R}$ a $\mathbf{T}$-homogeneity. A collection of such maps $\varsigma = (\varsigma_{\mathbf{T}})_{\mathbf{T} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{V}}}$ is called a *total homogeneity*. Addition of total homogeneities is defined pointwise.

We introduce two special families of total homogeneities which will play the role of "Kronecker deltas" out of which we will build other total homogenieties. Given any subset $\tilde{\mathcal{V}} \subset \mathcal{V}$, the total homogeneities $\delta^{\uparrow}[\tilde{\mathcal{V}}]$ and $\delta^{\Uparrow}[\tilde{\mathcal{V}}]$ are given by setting, for every $\mathbf{T} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{V}}$ and $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}$,

$$\delta^{\uparrow}_{\mathbf{T}}[\tilde{\mathcal{V}}](a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{1}\Big\{a = \tilde{\mathcal{V}}^{\uparrow,\mathbf{T}}\Big\} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta^{\Uparrow}_{\mathbf{T}}[\tilde{\mathcal{V}}](a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{1}\Big\{a = \tilde{\mathcal{V}}^{\Uparrow,\mathbf{T}}\Big\},$$

where the superscript $\mathbf{T}$ is used to remind readers that these operations are $\mathbf{T}$-dependent. For $u \in \mathcal{V}$ we will write $\delta^{\uparrow}[u]$ or $\delta^{\Uparrow}[u]$ instead of $\delta^{\uparrow}[\{u\}]$ or $\delta^{\Uparrow}[\{u\}]$.

Given $\mathbf{T} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{V}}$, a $\mathbf{T}$-homogeneity $\varsigma_{\mathbf{T}}$, and $\mathbf{s} \in \mathrm{Lab}_{\mathbf{T}}$ we often use the shorthand

$$\langle \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}}, \mathbf{s} \rangle = \sum_{a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}} \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}}(a)\mathbf{s}(a) \; .$$

Definition A.4 Given a set of scale assignments $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}$ and a total homogeneity ς we say that a family of continuous compactly supported functions $F = (F^{\mathbf{n}})_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}}$ on $(\mathbf{R}^d)^{\mathcal{V}_0}$ is bounded by ς if the following conditions hold.

1. There exists $x_{v_0} \in \mathbf{R}^d$ such that for each $(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}} \ltimes \mathrm{Lab}_{\bullet}$, and $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{tri}}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{s})$, one has
$$\mathrm{supp}\,(F^{\mathbf{n}}(\cdot)) \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{s}, x_{v_0}) \; . \tag{A.2}$$
2. One has the bound
$$\|F\|_{\varsigma, \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\substack{\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}} \\ \mathbf{s} \in \mathrm{Lab}_{\mathbf{T}} \\ \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{tri}}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{s})}} 2^{-\langle \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}}, \mathbf{s} \rangle} \sup_{x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\mathcal{V}_0}} |F^{\mathbf{n}}(x)| < \infty. \tag{A.3}$$

(In the particular case $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}} = \mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{G}}$ we will also just write $\|F\|_{\varsigma}$.)

Remark A.5 Because of the domain constraint (A.2), it is clear that $F^{\mathbf{n}}$ must vanish unless $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{tri},\mathbf{G}}$, where

$$\mathcal{N}_{\text{tri},\mathbf{G}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigsqcup_{(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}} \ltimes \mathrm{Lab}_{\bullet}} \mathcal{N}_{\text{tri}}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{s}) \; .$$

Remark A.6 The reader should be careful with notation here since there is quite a big of suppressed dependence on the notation. While $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}}$ is the set of all coalesence trees on $\mathcal{V}$ once one also specifies a connected graph $\mathbf{G}$ on $\mathcal{V}$ and a set of scales $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}$ then the contrainted set of trees $\hat{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{V}}$ depends on the set $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}$.

Moreover, the notion of being "bounded" by a total homogeneity ς depends on a invisible "combinatorial" constant C hidden in (A.1) - this affects both the domain

constraint (A.2) and the definition of $\| \cdot \|_{\varsigma,\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}}$. In practice we want to be able to formulate that this constant C can be chosen independently of certain parameters. Thus, if we a collections of families of functions $F_\theta = (F_\theta^{\mathbf{n}})_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}}$ where θ varies as a parameter in some set Θ we say that a the collection of families F_θ are bounded uniform in $\theta \in \Theta$ by a total homogeneity ς if one can use the same constant C in (A.1) for all values of $\theta \in \Theta$.

Definition A.7 Given a set of scale assignments $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}$ and a total homogeneity ς, we say that ς is subdivergence free in $\bar{\mathcal{V}} \subset \mathcal{V}$ for the set of scales $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}$ if for every $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}}$ and every $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}} \setminus \{\varrho_{\mathbf{T}}\}$ with $\mathbf{L}_a \subset \bar{\mathcal{V}}$ one has

$$\sum_{b\in\mathring{\mathbf{T}}_{\geq a}} \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}}(a) < (|\mathbf{L}_a| - 1)|\mathfrak{s}|. \tag{A.4}$$

Definition A.8 We say a total homogeneity ς is of order $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$ if for every $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}}$ one has $\sum_{a\in\mathring{\mathbf{T}}} \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}}(a) - (|\mathcal{V}| - 1)|\mathfrak{s}| = \alpha$.

The following definition will be quite useful in getting good bounds on various integrals.

Definition A.9 Given a family of continuous compactly supported functions $F = (F^{\mathbf{n}})_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}}$ on $(\mathbf{R}^d)^{\mathcal{V}_0}$ and a subset $A \subset \mathcal{V}_0$ we denote by $\mathrm{Mod}_A(F)$ the collection of all family of continuous compactly supported functions $\tilde{F} = (\tilde{F}^{\mathbf{n}})_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}}$ such that there exists $x_{v_0} \in \mathbf{R}^d$ with the property that for every $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}$ one has

$$\mathrm{supp}\left(\tilde{F}^{\mathbf{n}}(\cdot)\right) \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{s}, x_{v_0}) \tag{A.5}$$

and for any $x \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^A$

$$\int_{\mathcal{V}_0\setminus A} dy\; F^{\mathbf{n}}(x \sqcup y) = \int_{\mathcal{V}_0\setminus A} dy\; \tilde{F}^{\mathbf{n}}(x \sqcup y)\;.$$

We also use the notation $\mathrm{Mod}(F) = \bigcup_{A\subset\mathcal{V}_0} \mathrm{Mod}_A(F)$.

Theorem A.10 *Suppose we are given a set of scales $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}$ and a family of smooth compactly supported functions $F = (F^{\mathbf{n}})_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}}$ on $(\mathbf{R}^d)^{\mathcal{V}_0}$ and a total homogeneity ς on the trees of $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{V}}$ which is of order α and subdivergence free on $\mathcal{V}$.*

For $r \in \mathbf{N}$ we define

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G},>r} \stackrel{def}{=} \{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}} :\; \min_{e\in\mathbf{G}} n_e > r\} \;\text{ and }\; \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G},\leq r} \stackrel{def}{=} \{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}} :\; \min_{e\in\mathbf{G}} n_e \leq r\}\;. \tag{A.6}$$

Then, for $\alpha > 0$, one has

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G},\leq r}} \int_{\mathcal{V}_0} dy\; |F^{\mathbf{n}}(y)| \leq \mathrm{const}(|\mathcal{V}|)2^{\alpha r} \inf_{\tilde{F}\in\mathrm{Mod}(F)} \|\tilde{F}\|_{\varsigma,\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G},\leq r}}$$

while for $\alpha < 0$ one has

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G},>r}} \int_{\mathcal{V}_0} dy\, |F^{\mathbf{n}}(y)| \leq \text{const}(|\mathcal{V}|) 2^{\alpha r} \inf_{\tilde{F}\in \text{Mod}(F)} \|\tilde{F}\|_{\varsigma,\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G},>r}} \,.$$

Here, const$(|\mathcal{V}|)$ *is a combinatorial factor depending only on $|\mathcal{V}|$ and not on r.*

Proof. This is essentially a special case of [HQ15, Lem. A.10] with $\nu_\star$ equal to the root of $\mathbf{T}$. The only difference is that our "subdivergence-free condition" does not include the root itself. In the case $\alpha < 0$, Definition A.8 implies that (A.4) also holds for the root and we can apply [HQ15, Lem. A.10]. In the case $\alpha > 0$, this is not the case, but the proof of [HQ15, Lem. A.10] still applies, the only difference being that the sum appearing in the base case $|\mathring{\mathbf{T}}| = 1$ runs over large scales instead of small scales. □

For the next theorem and what follows, for any $\mathbf{T} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{V}}$ and $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}$ we define

$$\mathbf{T}_{\not\geq a} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{b \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}} :\ b \not\geq a\} \,.$$

Theorem A.11 *Let $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}$ be fixed and let $\mathbf{G}_* \subset \mathbf{G}$ be non-empty subset of edges which connects the collection of vertices of $\mathcal{V}$ it is incident with, we denote this collection of vertices by $\mathcal{V}_*$.*

Suppose that we are given a family of functions $F = (F^{\mathbf{n}})_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}}$ and a total homogeneity ς which is sub-divergence free on $\mathcal{V}$, of order $\alpha < 0$, and satisfies the following large scale integrability condition: for every $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}}$ and $u \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}$ with both $u \leq (\mathcal{V}_*)^\uparrow$ and $\mathbf{T}_{\not\geq u} \neq \emptyset$ one has

$$\sum_{w\in\mathbf{T}_{\not\geq u}} \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}}(w) > |\mathfrak{s}|\, |\mathcal{V} \setminus \mathbf{L}_u| \,. \tag{A.7}$$

Then if we set, for any $r \in \mathbf{N}$,

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G},>r,\mathbf{G}_*} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big\{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}} :\ \min_{e\in\mathbf{G}_*} n_e \geq r\Big\}$$

we have the bound, uniform in r,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G},>r,\mathbf{G}_*}} \int dy_{\mathcal{V}_0}\, |F^{\mathbf{n}}(y)| \lesssim 2^{\alpha r} \inf_{\tilde{F}\in \text{Mod}(F)} \|\tilde{F}\|_{\varsigma,\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}} \,.$$

Proof. This is precisely the content of [HQ15, Lem. A.10]. □

We introduce one last piece of notation.

Definition A.12 Given a family of compactly supported functions $(F^{\mathbf{n}})_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}}$ on $(\mathbf{R}^d)^{\mathcal{V}_0}$ and a total homogeneity ς on the trees of $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{V}}$ and a subset $\tilde{\mathcal{V}} \subset \mathcal{V}_0$, we define

$$\|F\|_{\varsigma,\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}},\tilde{\mathcal{V}}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{k\in A} \|D^k F\|_{\varsigma^{(k)},\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}}$$

where

$$A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big\{ k \in (\mathbf{N}^d)^{N^*} : \ k \text{ supported on } \tilde{\mathcal{V}} \text{ and } \sup_{u\in N^*} |k(u)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \le |\mathfrak{s}| \Big\},$$

for $k \in A$ we write $D^k \tilde{F} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (D^k \tilde{F}^{\mathbf{n}})_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}}$, and $\varsigma^{(k)} = \varsigma + \sum_{u\in\tilde{\mathcal{V}}} |k(u)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \delta^{\uparrow}[u]$.

A.2 Multiscale clustering for cumulants

The types of bounds on cumulants we ask for in Definitions 2.14 and 2.16 place major limitations on the types of driving noises we can accommodate - we are basically restricted to space-time random fields that are either Gaussian, Gaussian-like (the kind of situation one encounters when considering a central-limit type convergence result as in [HS15]), or non-Gaussian random fields which have exponentially decaying cumulants.

In order to go beyond this setting we will need more data: in addition to a set of types $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}_+ \sqcup \mathfrak{L}_-$ and a homogeneity assignment $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ for $\mathfrak{L}$ one will need to prescribe a *cumulant homogeneity*. To define this notion we need some additional notation.

We want to use some of the multiclustering notation introduced earlier to describe our cumulant bounds. For $N \in \mathbf{N}$ with $N \ge 2$ we view $[N]$ as a vertex set and we take $\mathbf{G} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [N]^{(2)}$ to be the full graph. We arbitrarily choose that "1" is the root, and we set $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{G}}$ for our set of scales. In this case, we then have $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{[N]} = \mathcal{U}_{[N]}$, the set of all coalescence trees on $[N]$.

We also define

$$\mathfrak{L}_{\text{Cum}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(\mathfrak{t}, [M]) : \ M \in \mathbf{N}, M \ge 2, \text{ and } \mathfrak{t} : [M] \to \mathfrak{L}_-\} \ .$$

Definition A.13 Given a homogeneity assignment $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$, a cumulant homogeneity $\mathfrak{c}$ consistent with $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is a collection of total homogeneities

$$\mathfrak{c} = (\mathfrak{c}^{(\mathfrak{t},[M])})_{(\mathfrak{t},[M])\in\mathfrak{L}_{\text{Cum}}}$$

where for each $(\mathfrak{t}, [M]) \in \mathfrak{L}_{\text{Cum}}$, the total homogeneity $\mathfrak{c}^{(\mathfrak{t},[M])} = (\mathfrak{c}_{\mathbf{T}}^{(\mathfrak{t},[M])})_{\mathbf{T}\in\mathcal{U}_{[M]}}$ satisfies the following properties for every $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{[M]}$.

1.
$$\sum_{u\in\mathring{\mathbf{T}}} \mathfrak{c}_{\mathbf{T}}^{(\mathfrak{t},[M])}(u) = -|\mathfrak{t}([M])|_{\mathfrak{s}} \ .$$

2. For every $D \subset [M]$,

$$\sum_{\substack{u \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}} \\ u \le v \text{ for some } v \in D}} \mathfrak{c}_{\mathbf{T}}^{(\mathfrak{t},[M])}(u) \ge -|\mathfrak{t}(D)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \ . \tag{A.8}$$

3. For every $D \subset [M]$,

$$\sum_{u \in \mathbf{T}_{\ge D^{\uparrow}}} \mathfrak{c}_{\mathbf{T}}^{(\mathfrak{t},[M])}(u) \le -|\mathfrak{t}(D)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \ . \tag{A.9}$$

4. If $M \ge 3$ then for every $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}$ with $|L_a| = 2$ one has $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathbf{T}}^{(\mathfrak{t},[M])}(a) < |\mathfrak{s}|$.

Remark A.14 It is not hard to see that if item 1 of Definition A.13 is assumed then items 2 and 3 are equivalent.

Definition A.15 For any cumulant homogeneity $\mathfrak{c}$, $N \ge 2$, and $\xi \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_0)$ we set

$$\|\xi\|_{N,\mathfrak{c}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{\substack{(\mathfrak{t},[M]) \in \mathfrak{L}_{\text{Cum}} \\ M \le N}} \|\mathbf{E}^c[\{\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(i)}(x_i)\}_{i=1}^M]\|_{\mathfrak{c}^{(\mathfrak{t},[M])}}$$

where on the RHS we are using the notation of (A.3).

We will sometimes abuse notation, for a cumulant homogeneity $\mathfrak{c}$ and pair $(\mathfrak{t}, A)$, where A is some finite set of cardinality at least 2 and $\mathfrak{t} : A \to \mathfrak{L}_-$, we write $\mathfrak{c}^{(\mathfrak{t},A)}$ for the corresponding total homogeneity on $\mathcal{U}_A$.

Definition A.16 For any homogeneity assignment $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$, cumulant homogeneity $\mathfrak{c}$ consistent with $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$, $N \ge 2$, and $\xi, \bar{\xi} \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_0)$ defined on the same probability space and jointly admitting pointwise cumulants we define the quantity $\|\xi; \bar{\xi}\|_{N,\mathfrak{c}}$ as follows.

$$\|\xi; \bar{\xi}\|_{N,\mathfrak{c}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\substack{(\mathfrak{t},[M]) \in \mathfrak{L}_{\text{Cum}}, \\ \hat{M} \le M \le N}} \|\mathbf{E}^c[\{\hat{\xi}_{\mathfrak{t}(i),i}(x_i)\}_{i=1}^M]\|_{\mathfrak{c}^{(\mathfrak{t},M)},\mathbf{N}^{[M]^{(2)}}} \ .$$

As before, the random fields $(\hat{\xi}_{\mathfrak{t},i})_{i=1}^M$ are given by

$$\hat{\xi}_{\mathfrak{t},i}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \xi_{\mathfrak{t}}(x)\mathbb{1}\{i \le \hat{M}\} - \bar{\xi}_{\mathfrak{t}}(x)\mathbb{1}\{i \ge \hat{M}\} \ .$$

If ξ and $\bar{\xi}$ don't admit joint pointwise cumulants we set $\|\xi; \bar{\xi}\|_{N,\mathfrak{c}} = \infty$ for every N.

The following definition will be useful.

Definition A.17 Assume we are given a cumulant homogeneity $\mathfrak{c}$ consistent with a homogeneity assignment $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and a a finite set A endowed with a map $\mathfrak{t} : A \to \mathfrak{L}_-$

We then define the quantity $|\mathfrak{t}(A)|_{\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{c}} \leq 0$ as follows: if $|A| \leq 1$ we set $|\mathfrak{t}(A)|_{\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{c}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$ and otherwise we set $\mathfrak{t}(A)$ equal to

$$\inf \left\{ - \sum_{u \in \mathbf{T}_{\geq a}} \mathfrak{c}^{(\mathfrak{t}', A \sqcup [N])}(u) : \begin{array}{l} N \geq 1,\ \mathfrak{t}' : A \sqcup [N] \to \mathfrak{L}_- \text{ with } \mathfrak{t}' \restriction A = \mathfrak{t}, \\ \mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{A \sqcup [N]} \text{ with } a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}} \text{ s.t. } L_a = A. \end{array} \right\}. \tag{A.10}$$

Observe that one always has

$$|\mathfrak{t}(A)|_{\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{c}} \geq |\mathfrak{t}(A)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \,. \tag{A.11}$$

In order to get the desired stochastic estimates when we use a cumulant homogeneity $\mathfrak{c}$ to control cumulants we also need a stronger notion of super-regularity.

Definition A.18 Given a homogeneity assignment $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and a cumulant homogeneity $\mathfrak{c}$ consistent with $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$, and a set A equipped with a map $\mathfrak{t} : A \to \mathfrak{L}_-$, we define $\hbar_{\mathfrak{c}}(\emptyset) = 0$ and, for $A \neq \emptyset$,

$$\hbar_{\mathfrak{c}}(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{\emptyset \neq B \subset A} (|\mathfrak{t}(B)|_{\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{c}} - |\mathfrak{t}(B)|_{\mathfrak{s}}) \,. \tag{A.12}$$

A semi-decorated $T^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\mathfrak{c}}$ is said to be $(\mathfrak{c}, |\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}})$-*super-regular* if it is super-regular with respect to $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and for every subtree S of T with $|L(S)| > 1$ one has

$$|S^0_{\mathfrak{c}}|_{\mathfrak{s}} + \hbar_{\mathfrak{c}}(L(S)) > 0.$$

Remark A.19 One should think of $\hbar_{\mathfrak{c}}(A)$ as quantifying the minimum homogeneity gain from having the set of noises A not participate in "internal" cumulants.

Remark A.20 Given a homogeneity assignment $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ one choice of cumulant homogeneity $\mathfrak{c}$ consistent with $|\cdot|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is given by setting, for each $(\mathfrak{t}, [M]) \in \mathfrak{L}_{\text{Cum}}$, the total homogeneity $(\mathfrak{c}^{(\mathfrak{t},[M])}_{\mathbf{T}})_{\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{[M]}}$ to be given by $\mathfrak{c}^{(\mathfrak{t},[M])}_{\mathbf{T}}(a) = \mathbb{1}\{a = \varrho_{\mathbf{T}}\}$ for every $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{[M]}$ and $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}$. This is precisely the choice of $\mathfrak{c}$ being referred to in Remark 2.19.

It is useful to formalize how the cumulant homogeneity will be used with regards to larger integrands, which motivates the following definition.

Definition A.21 Let $\mathfrak{c}$ be a cumulant homogeneity, let A be a finite set, and let $B \subset A$ be of cardinality at least 2 and suppose we also have a type map $\mathfrak{t} : B \to \mathfrak{L}_-$. We will now define a total homogeneity $\mathfrak{c}^B = (\mathfrak{c}^B_{\mathbf{T}})_{\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_A}$.

Fix $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_A$, we now specify how to define $\mathfrak{c}^B_{\mathbf{T}}$. There is a natural choice of a tree $\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{U}_B$ which is the "restriction of $\mathbf{T}$ to B". We can precisely define $\mathbf{S}$ as follows - recall that $N_{\mathbf{T}}$ can be identified with a subset of 2^A. Using this identification, we then define $N_{\mathbf{S}} = \{D \cap B :\ D \in N_{\mathbf{T}},\ D \cap B \neq \emptyset\}$. We then equip $N_{\mathbf{T}'}$ with the

reverse inclusion partial order as in Section A - this finishes the specification of $\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{U}_B$. We then set

$$\mathfrak{c}_{\mathbf{T}}^{B}(u) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \mathfrak{c}_{\mathbf{S}}^{(\mathfrak{t},B)}(a) & \text{if } u = (\mathbf{L}_a)^{\uparrow,\mathbf{T}} \text{ for } a \in \mathbf{S} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where above, for $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{S}}$, the operation $\mathbf{L}_a$ is of course taken in $\mathbf{S}$. The definition is well-defined since for fixed $u \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}$ any $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{S}}$ satisfying the constraint of the first case must be unique (this is a consequence of how we defined $\mathbf{S}$).

We draw a picture to make this clearer. Here $A = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^{4} \sqcup \{b_i\}_{i=1}^{5}$ and $B = \{b_i\}_{i=1}^{5}$. To the left we have drawn a choice of $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_A$ and on the right the corresponding $\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{U}_B$. We want to describe how a choice of weights on $\mathring{\mathbf{S}}$ is transferred to $\mathring{\mathbf{T}}$ and our labels on the coalescence nodes indicates how one maps the former into the latter. The unlabeled coalescence nodes on the right hand tree are given weight 0.



A.3 Multiscale clustering for Wick contractions

Definition A.22 Let A be a finite set and p be a positive integer. We denote by $\{A^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^{p}$ p distinct copies of the set A. A p-fold Wick contraction on A is a partition π of $\bigsqcup_{j=1}^{p} A^{(j)}$ which satisfies the condition that for any $B \in \pi$ we have $B \not\subset A^{(j)}$ for any $1 \leq j \leq p$. In other words, each element of the partition is required to straddle at least two copies of A.

Theorem A.23 *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a finite set of cardinality at least two with a distinguished element $\circledast \in \mathcal{X}$ and a subset $\ell \subset \mathcal{X}_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{X} \setminus \{\circledast\}$ equipped with a type map $\mathfrak{t} : \ell \to \mathfrak{L}_-$.*

Let $\mathbf{H} \subset \mathcal{X}^{(2)}$ be a connected graph on $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H}} \subset \mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{H}}$ be a set of scales. Let $\mathbf{H}_* \subset \mathbf{H}$ be a non-empty connected subset of edges such that $\mathcal{X}_*$, the set of vertices incident to $\mathbf{H}_*$, is disjoint from ℓ.

Let ς be a total homogeneity on $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ with the following properties:

1. *ς is of order $\alpha < |\mathfrak{t}(\ell)|_{\mathfrak{s}}$.*
2. *Using the notation $\hbar_{\mathfrak{c}}(\cdot)$ of* (A.12)*, one has, for every $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}$,*

$$\sum_{b \in \mathbf{T}_{\geq a}} \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}}(b) < |\mathfrak{s}| \, (|\mathbf{L}_a| - 1) + |\mathfrak{t}\big(\mathbf{L}_a^{\text{ext}}\big)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \tag{A.13}$$

$$+ \mathbb{1}\{\mathbf{L}_a \not\ni \circledast\}[\hbar_{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathbf{L}_a^{\mathrm{ext}}) \wedge \min_{\mathfrak{t}' \in \mathfrak{L}_-} (|\mathfrak{s}| + |\mathfrak{t}'|_{\mathfrak{s}})] \,,$$

where we used the notation $\mathbf{L}_a^{\mathrm{ext}} \stackrel{def}{=} \{u \in \ell : u \in \mathbf{L}_a\}$.

3. *For any* $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$ *and* $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}$ *with both* $a \le \mathcal{X}_*^{\uparrow}$ *and* $\mathbf{T}_{\not\ge a} \neq \emptyset$ *one has*

$$\sum_{b \in \mathbf{T}_{\not\ge a}} \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}}(b) > |\mathfrak{s}|\,|\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathbf{L}_a| + |\mathfrak{t}(L \setminus \mathbf{L}_a^{\mathrm{ext}})|_{\mathfrak{s}} \,. \tag{A.14}$$

Then, for any $p \in \mathbf{N}$*, there exists* $C > 0$ *such that for any family of functions* $G = (G^{\mathbf{n}})_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H}}}$ *on* $(\mathbf{R}^d)^{\mathcal{X}_0}$ *bounded by* ς *(for some choice of* $x_{\circledast} \in \mathbf{R}^d$ *where* $\circledast$ *serves as the pinned vertex of* $\mathcal{X}$*), one has the estimate*

$$\mathbf{E}\Big(\int_{\mathcal{X}_0} dy \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H},>r,\mathbf{H}_*}} G^{\mathbf{n}}(y) \cdot \mathrm{Wick}(\{\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(u)}(y_u)\})_{u \in \ell} \Big)^{2p} \tag{A.15}$$
$$\le C \|\xi\|_{2p|\ell|,\mathfrak{c}} \cdot \lambda^{2p\beta} \cdot \inf_{\tilde{G} \in \mathrm{Mod}_\ell(G)} \|\tilde{G}\|^{2p}_{\varsigma,\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H}},\ell},$$

where $\beta \stackrel{def}{=} \alpha + |\mathfrak{t}(\ell)|_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

Proof. Observe that the LHS of (A.15) does not change if we replace G with $\tilde{G}$ in $\mathrm{Mod}_\ell(G)$ - for the rest of the proof we fix such a $\tilde{G}$. Next, recall that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H},>r,\mathbf{H}_*}} \tilde{G}^{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}} \Big(\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H},>r,\mathbf{H}_*} \\ \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{n}) = \mathbf{T}}} \tilde{G}^{\mathbf{n}} \Big) \,,$$

where the number of terms in outer sum on the RHS is bounded by some finite combinatorial constant depending on $|\mathcal{X}|$. Fix some choice of $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$. By the triangle inequality it suffices to prove (A.15) where on the LHS we replace

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H},>r,\mathbf{H}_*}} G^{\mathbf{n}} \text{ with } \hat{G} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H},>r,\mathbf{H}_*} \\ \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{n}) = \mathbf{T}}} \tilde{G}^{\mathbf{n}}$$

and on the RHS of (A.15) we drop the infinum over $\tilde{G}$ (since it has been fixed).

We write $\mathcal{X}_0^{(j)}$ for $j = 1, \dots, 2p$ be $2p$ disjoint copies of $\mathcal{X}_0$. We write $\mathcal{V}_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{2p} \mathcal{X}_0^{(j)}$, $\mathcal{V} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{V}_0 \sqcup \{\circledast\}$, and $\mathcal{X}^{(j)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{X}_0^{(j)} \sqcup \{\circledast\}$. We also set $\ell^{\mathrm{all}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{2p} \ell^{(j)} \subset \mathcal{V}_0$, so that $2p$-fold Wick contractions are naturally identified with partitions of ℓ^{all}. Note that the type map $\mathfrak{t}$ naturally yields a type map on ℓ^{all} which we again call $\mathfrak{t}$.

Using standard facts about the expansion of moments of Wick powers into sums over Wick contractions (see [HS15, Lem. 4.5]) it suffices to show that for any any fixed $2p$-fold Wick contraction π on ℓ one has

$$\Big| \int_{\mathcal{V}_0} dy \Big(\prod_{j=1}^{2p} \hat{G}(y^{(j)}) \Big) \Big(\prod_{B \in \pi} \mathbf{E}^c[\{\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(u)}(y_u)\}_{u \in B}] \Big) \Big| \tag{A.16}$$

$$\lesssim \|\tilde{G}\|^{2p}_{\varsigma,\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H},\lambda},\ell} \|\xi\|_{2p|\ell|,\mathfrak{c}} \lambda^{2p\beta} \ .$$

where we use the shorthand $y^{(j)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} y_{\mathcal{X}_0^{(j)}}$.

For $j \in [2p]$ and $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{X}}$, we write $\mathbf{H}^{(j)}$ and $\mathbf{T}^{(j)}$ for the corresponding copies of $\mathbf{H}$ and $\mathbf{T}$ on the vertex set $\mathcal{X}^{(j)}$. To prove (A.16) we will apply Theorem A.11 with $\mathcal{V}$ as the vertex set, and $\circledast$ as the root vertex - we know that $\hat{G}$ satisfies (A.2) for some choice of $x_\circledast \in \mathbf{R}^d$ - this will be fixed throughout our whole application of Theorem A.11 but our bounds don't depend on this variable.

The underlying graph is given by $\mathbf{G} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{\mathbf{G}} \sqcup \mathbf{C}$ where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{G}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{2p} \mathbf{H}^{(j)} \text{ and } \mathbf{C} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big\{ \{v, v'\} \in \mathcal{V}^{(2)} : \ \exists B \in \pi \text{ with } v, v' \in B \Big\} \ .$$

We define a distinguished set of edges $\mathbf{G}_* = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{2p} \mathbf{H}_*^{(j)}$ where $\mathbf{H}_*^{(j)}$ denote the copies of $\mathbf{H}_*$. There is a natural identification of $\bigtimes_{j=1}^{2p} \mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{H}^{(j)}}$ with $\mathbf{N}^{\tilde{\mathbf{G}}}$ and using this identification we define our set of scales $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}} \subset \mathbf{N}^{\tilde{\mathbf{G}}} \times \mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{G}}$ by

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\bigtimes_{j=1}^{2p} \left[\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H},>r,\mathbf{H}_*} \cap \mathcal{T}^{-1}(\mathbf{T}^{(j)}) \right] \right) \times \mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{C}}.$$

Note that then $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G},>r,\mathbf{G}_*} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}$. We write $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}}$ for the corresponding set of coalescence trees on $\mathcal{V}$. Elements $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}$ are often denoted as pairs $\mathbf{m} = (\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathbf{N}^{\tilde{\mathbf{G}}} \times \mathbf{N}^{\mathbf{C}}$.

Let the family of functions $F = (F^{\mathbf{m}})_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}}$ on $(\mathbf{R}^d)^{\mathcal{V}_0}$ for which we apply Theorem A.11 be given by

$$F_\lambda^{(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{j})}(y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big(\prod_{j=1}^{2p} \hat{G}(y^{(j)}) \Big) \text{WickCum}^{\mathbf{j}}(y) \tag{A.17}$$

where we used the natural correspondance $(\mathbf{n}_j)_{j=1}^{2p} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{n}$ and set

$$\text{WickCum}^{\mathbf{j}}(y_{\ell^{\text{all}}}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{B \in \pi} \Big[\mathbf{E}^c[\{\xi_{\mathfrak{t}(u)}(y_u)\}_{u \in B}] \prod_{\{u,v\} \in B^{(2)}} \Psi^{(j_{\{u,v\}})}(y_u - y_v) \Big].$$

We will define a total homogeneity $\tilde{\varsigma} = \{\tilde{\varsigma}_{\mathbf{S}}\}_{\mathbf{S} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{V}}}$ and $\tilde{F} \in \text{Mod}(F)$ such that $\tilde{F}$ is bounded by $\tilde{\varsigma}$ (the root vertex position for (A.2) will be given by $x_\circledast$) and with the property that

$$\|\tilde{F}\|_{\tilde{\varsigma},\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{G}}} \lesssim \|\xi\|_{2p|\ell|,\mathfrak{c}} \cdot \|\tilde{G}\|^{2p}_{\varsigma,\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H}},\ell} \ . \tag{A.18}$$

We will then check that $\tilde{\varsigma}$ satisfies the conditions of Theorem A.11.

We start by defining $\tilde{\varsigma}$. For each $j \in [2p]$ and $\mathbf{S} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathcal{V}}$ we define a map $\theta_{j,\mathbf{S}} : \mathring{\mathbf{T}}^{(j)} \to \mathring{\mathbf{S}}$ by setting, for any $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{T}}^{(j)}$,

$$\theta_{j,\mathbf{S}}(a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathbf{L}_a)^{\uparrow,\mathbf{S}} \ .$$

For the remainder of the proof, whenever we write $\uparrow$ or $\Uparrow$ without specifying a tree then this operation is taken in $\mathbf{S}$.

For $j \in [2p]$ we define total homogeneities $\varsigma^j = \{\varsigma^j_{\mathbf{S}}\}_{\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{V}}$ by setting, for each $\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{V}$ and $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{S}}$,

$$\varsigma^j_{\mathbf{S}}(a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{b \in \theta^{-1}_{j,\mathbf{S}}(a)} \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}^{(j)}}(b)$$

where the total homogeneity ς was fixed in the assumption, $\mathbf{T}$ is the previously fixed tree in $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$, and the $\varsigma_{\mathbf{T}^{(j)}}$ are the corresponding copies of $\varsigma_{\mathbf{T}}$.

We introduce more total homogeneities on the trees of $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_\mathcal{V}$, setting $\bar{\varsigma} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{2p} \varsigma^j$, $\varsigma^C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{B \in \pi} \mathfrak{c}^B$ where we use Definition A.21, as well as ς^R by setting, for each $\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{V}$,

$$\varsigma^R_{\mathbf{S}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{B \in R(\mathbf{S})} \ell(B) \Big(\delta^{\Uparrow}_{\mathbf{S}}[B] - \delta^{\uparrow}_{\mathbf{S}}[B] \Big), \text{ where}$$

$$R(\mathbf{S}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ B \in \pi : \ \ell(B) > 0 \text{ and } \mathbf{L}_{B^\uparrow} = B \} ,$$

and $\ell(B)$ was defined in (8.7). Finally, we define $\tilde{\varsigma} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bar{\varsigma} + \varsigma^C + \varsigma^R$.

The family $\tilde{F}$ will be given by setting

$$\tilde{F}^{\mathbf{k}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} F^{\mathbf{k}} & \text{if } R(\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{k})) = \emptyset , \\ \mathring{F}^{\mathbf{k}} & \text{if } R(\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{k})) \neq \emptyset . \end{cases}$$

We will define $\mathring{F}^{\mathbf{k}}$ on a tree by tree basis later. It suffices to check the domain condition and desired supremum bound in each of the two cases separately.

We first treat the former case, that is when $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{V}$ satisfies $R(\mathbf{T}) = \emptyset$. The domain property (A.2) is straightforward to check and next we show the supremum bound. Uniformly over $j \in [2p]$, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathrm{Lab}_{\mathbf{S}}$, and $(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{tri}}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{s})$, one has

$$\sup_{y \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\mathcal{V}_0}} |\hat{G}^{\mathbf{n}^j}(y^{(j)})| \lesssim 2^{\langle \varsigma^j_{\mathbf{S}}, \mathbf{s} \rangle} \|\tilde{G}\|_{\varsigma, \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H}}} ,$$

as well as

$$\sup_{y \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\mathcal{V}_0}} |\mathrm{WickCum}^{\mathbf{j}}(y_{\ell^{\mathrm{all}}})| \lesssim 2^{\langle \varsigma^C_{\mathbf{S}}, \mathbf{s} \rangle} \|\xi\|_{2p|\ell|, \mathfrak{c}} .$$

Combining these two estimates and setting $\mathbf{m} = (\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{j})$ as above yields

$$\sup_{y \in (\mathbf{R}^d)^{\mathcal{V}_0}} |F^{\mathbf{m}}(y)| \lesssim 2^{\langle \varsigma_{\mathbf{S}}, \mathbf{s} \rangle} \|\tilde{G}\|^{2p}_{\varsigma, \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{H}}} \|\xi\|_{2p|\ell|, \mathfrak{c}} .$$

Now we treat the other case for $\tilde{F}$, we fix $\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{X}$ and suppose that $R(\mathbf{S}) \neq \emptyset$. We work similarly to Lemma 8.25 here. We again label, for each $B \in R(\mathbf{S})$, each of the elements of B with a $+$ or $-$, define sets of multi-indices $\mathrm{Der}(B)$, and operators $\mathscr{Y}_B$. Then for any $\mathbf{m} = (\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{N}_G$ with $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{S}$ we define $\mathring{F}^{\mathbf{m}}_{\lambda}$ via

$$\mathring{F}^{(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{j})}(y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big(\prod_{B \in R(\mathbf{S})} (1 - \mathscr{Y}_B) \Big) \Big[\bigotimes_{j=1}^{2p} \hat{G}^{\mathbf{n}^j} \Big](y) \cdot \mathrm{WickCum}^{\mathbf{j}}(y_{\ell^{\mathrm{all}}}) .$$

To see that both $\mathring{F}_\lambda^{(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{j})}$ and $F_\lambda^{(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{j})}$ integrate to the same value, one proceeds as in Lemma 8.25. The desired domain constraint for $\mathring{F}_\lambda^{(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{j})}$ is also straightforward to check - all that is left is the supremum bound.

Using [Hai14, Prop. A.1] we get, uniform in $\mathbf{s} \in \mathrm{Lab}_\mathbf{S}$ and $(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{tri}}(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{s})$, the supremum bound

$$\sup_{y\in(\mathbf{R}^d)^{\mathcal{V}_0}} \left|\mathring{F}_\lambda^{(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{j})}(y)\right| \lesssim \max_{k\in \mathrm{Der}(R(\mathbf{S}))} \Big(\prod_{B\in R(\mathbf{S})} 2^{-|k_{(+,B)}|_{\mathfrak{s}} j_B} \Big) \cdot \sup_{y\in(\mathbf{R}^d)^{\mathcal{V}_0}} \Big| \mathrm{WickCum}^{\mathbf{j}}(y_{\ell^{\mathrm{all}}}) \prod_{j=1}^{2p} D^{k_j} \hat{G}^{\mathbf{n}^j}(y^{(j)}) \Big| \tag{A.19}$$

where $\mathrm{Der}(R(\mathbf{S})) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sum_{B\in R(\mathbf{S})} \partial_{(+,B)} \mathrm{Der}(B)$ and, for any $k \in (\mathbf{N}^d)^{\mathcal{V}}$ and $j \in [2p]$, we set $k_j \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sum_{l\in\ell^{(j)}} k_l$. Now for any k appearing in (A.19) we have, uniform in $\mathbf{s} \in \mathrm{Lab}_\mathbf{S}$ and $(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{tri}}(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{s})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{y\in(\mathbf{R}^d)^{\mathcal{V}_0}} |D^{k_j}\hat{G}^{\mathbf{n}^j}(y^{(j)})| \\
&\leq \exp_2\Big[\Big\langle \varsigma_\mathbf{S}^j + \sum_{\substack{B\in R(\mathbf{S})\\(+,B)\in\ell^{(j)}}} |k_{(+,B)}|_{\mathfrak{s}} \mathbb{1}\Big\{\bullet = \theta_{j,\mathbf{S}}[(+,B)^{\uparrow,\mathbf{T}^{(j)}}]\Big\}, \mathbf{s}\Big\rangle\Big] \|\tilde{G}\|^{2p}_{\varsigma,\mathcal{N}_\mathbf{H},\ell} \\
&\leq \exp_2\Big[\Big\langle \varsigma_\mathbf{S}^j + \sum_{\substack{B\in R(\mathbf{S})\\(+,B)\in\ell^{(j)}}} |k_{(+,B)}|_{\mathfrak{s}} \delta_\mathbf{S}^{\uparrow\Uparrow}[B], \mathbf{s}\Big\rangle\Big] \|\tilde{G}\|^{2p}_{\varsigma,\mathcal{N}_\mathbf{H},\ell} \,.
\end{aligned}$$

In going to the third line above we used the fact that in the partial order on the nodes of $\mathbf{S}$ one has $B^{\Uparrow} \geq \theta_{j,\mathbf{S}}[(+,B)^{\uparrow,\mathbf{T}^{(j)}}]$ which can be justified as follows: the inner node on the left corresponds to the first coalescence event in $\mathbf{S}$ where the component containing $(+,B)$ contains a distinct element from the same copy of $\mathcal{X}_0$ that $(+,B)$ is from, however this must happen strictly after $(+,B)$ combines with $(-,B)$ to form a component of cardinality 2.

It follows that uniform in $\mathbf{s} \in \mathrm{Lab}_\mathbf{S}$ and $(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{tri}}(\mathbf{S},\mathbf{s})$ we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{y\in(\mathbf{R}^d)^{\mathcal{V}_0}} \left|\mathring{F}_\lambda^{(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{j})}(y)\right| &\lesssim 2^{\langle \bar{\varsigma}_\mathbf{S},\mathbf{s}\rangle} \|\xi\|_{2p|\ell|,\mathfrak{c}} \|\tilde{G}\|^{2p}_{\varsigma,\mathcal{N}_\mathbf{H},\ell} \\
&\cdot \max_{k\in\mathrm{Der}(\mathbf{S})} \exp_2\big[\langle \sum_{B\in R(\mathbf{S})} |k_{(+,B)}|_{\mathfrak{s}} (\delta_\mathbf{S}^{\Uparrow}[B] - \delta_\mathbf{S}^{\uparrow}[B]), \mathbf{s}\rangle\big] \,.
\end{aligned}$$

To obtain the desired result observe that the maximum over k on the RHS is acheived when $|k_{(+,B)}|_{\mathfrak{s}} = \mathfrak{f}(B)$ for each $B \in R(\mathbf{S})$. This finishes the proof of (A.18).

We now check that $\tilde{\varsigma}$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem A.11. It is easy to see that the total homogeneity $\tilde{\varsigma}$ is of order $\beta \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} 2p(\alpha + |\mathfrak{t}(\ell)|_{\mathfrak{s}}) > 0$.

Next we prove that $\tilde{\varsigma}$ is subdivergence free on $\mathcal{V}$ for the set of scales $\mathcal{N}_\mathbf{G}$. In what follows we make frequent and implicit use of Assumption 2.17 and the following

trivial bound - for any $L' \subset \ell^{\text{all}}$

$$-\sum_{\substack{B\in\pi\\ B\subset L'}} |\mathfrak{t}(B)|_{\mathfrak{s}} - \sum_{\substack{B\in\pi\\ B\not\subset L'}} |\mathfrak{t}(B)|_{\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{c}} \le -|\mathfrak{t}(L')|_{\mathfrak{s}} \; . \tag{A.20}$$

Fix $\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{V}}$ and $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{S}}$. For each $j \in [2p]$ we write

$$\mathbf{L}_a^j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{L}_a \cap \mathcal{X}^{(j)}, \quad \mathbf{L}_a^{j,\text{ext}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{L}_a^j \cap \ell^j, \qquad \bar{\mathbf{L}}_a^{\text{ext}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{2p} \mathbf{L}_a^{j,\text{ext}} \; .$$

We also define two sets of indices

$$J_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{j \in [2p] : \; |\mathbf{L}_a^{(j)}| = 1\} \text{ and } J_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{j \in [2p] : \; |\mathbf{L}_a^{(j)}| \ge 2\} \; . \tag{A.21}$$

Given $a \in \mathring{\mathbf{S}}$ and $j \in [2p]$, we also write a^j as a shorthand for

$$a^j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathbf{L}_a^j)^{\uparrow,\mathbf{T}^{(j)}} \; .$$

We first treat the case when $\mathbf{L}_a \not\ni \circledast$; this is done by checking a variety of subcases. Restricting to this case, for every $j \in J_1$ we have $\mathbf{L}_a^{(j)} \subset \ell^{(j)}$. In the subcase where $J_2 = \emptyset$ we have

$$\sum_{b\in\mathbf{S}_{\ge a}} \tilde{\varsigma}_{\mathbf{S}}(b) \le -|\mathfrak{t}(\bar{\mathbf{L}}_a^{\text{ext}})|_{\mathfrak{s}} + \sum_{B\in R(\mathbf{S})} \ell(B) \mathbb{1}\{\bar{\mathbf{L}}_a^{\text{ext}} = B\} \; .$$

It is immediate that the RHS is strictly bounded above by $|\mathfrak{s}|$ if $|\mathbf{L}_a| = 2$, while if $|\mathbf{L}_a| > 2$ it is bounded above by $\frac{2|\mathfrak{s}|}{3}|\mathbf{L}_a|$ which is strictly bounded above by $|\mathfrak{s}|(|\mathbf{L}_a| - 1)$. This finishes the subcase $J_2 = \emptyset$.

For the subcase $J_1 = \emptyset$ and $J_2 = \{j\}$, we write $B^{a,j} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} B \cap \mathbf{L}_a^{j,\text{ext}}$ and set $\pi^{a,j} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{B \in \pi \; : \; B^{a,j} \neq \emptyset\}$. With this notation, we have

$$\sum_{b\in\mathbf{S}_{\ge a}} \tilde{\varsigma}_{\mathbf{S}}(b) \le \sum_{c\in\mathbf{T}^{(j)}_{\ge a^j}} \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}^{(j)}}(c) - \sum_{B\in\pi^{a,j}} |\mathfrak{t}(B^{a,j})|_{\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{c}} \; . \tag{A.22}$$

To see that the RHS is bounded by $(|\mathbf{L}_a| - 1)|\mathfrak{s}| = (|\mathbf{L}_a^j| - 1)|\mathfrak{s}|$ first note that it is immediate by (A.13) when the second sum on the RHS of (A.22) is empty. When the sum is not empty we then use $|\mathfrak{t}(\bullet)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \le |\mathfrak{t}(\bullet)|_{\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{c}}$ for all but one block B contributing to the sum to get the inequality

$$-\sum_{B\in\pi^{a,j}} |\mathfrak{t}(B^{a,j})|_{\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{c}} \le -|\mathfrak{t}(\mathbf{L}_a^{j,\text{ext}})|_{\mathfrak{s}} + \min_{B\in\pi^{a,j}} (|\mathfrak{t}(B^{a,j})|_{\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{c}} - |\mathfrak{t}(B^{a,j})|_{\mathfrak{s}}) \; . \tag{A.23}$$

Recall that the last term on the RHS of (A.23) is bounded above by $\hbar_{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathbf{L}_a^{j,\text{ext}})$. Therefore by (A.13) the RHS of (A.22) must be strictly bounded above by $(|\mathbf{L}_a^j| - 1)|\mathfrak{s}|$.

Now for the subcase $(J_1, J_2) = (\{m\}, \{j\})$ observe that

$$\sum_{b\in\mathbf{S}_{\geq a}} \tilde{\varsigma}_{\mathbf{S}}(b) \leq \sum_{c\in\mathbf{T}^{(j)}_{\geq a^{(j)}}} \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}^{(j)}}(c) - |\mathfrak{t}(\mathbf{L}_a^{j,\mathrm{ext}})|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathfrak{t}(\mathbf{L}_a^{m,\mathrm{ext}})|_{\mathfrak{s}} \,, \tag{A.24}$$

then by using (A.13) for the copy j and that $|\mathfrak{t}(\mathbf{L}_a^{m,\mathrm{ext}})|_{\mathfrak{s}} \leq -\min_{\mathfrak{t}\in\mathfrak{L}_-} |\mathfrak{t}|_{\mathfrak{s}}$ we see that the RHS of (A.24) is strictly bounded above by $|\mathbf{L}_a^j|\,|\mathfrak{s}| = (|\mathbf{L}_a| - 1)|\mathfrak{s}|$.

Finally, suppose $J_2 \neq \emptyset$ and $(|J_1|, |J_2|) \neq (0,1)$ or $(1,1)$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{b\in\mathbf{S}_{\geq a}} \tilde{\varsigma}_{\mathbf{S}}(b) &\leq \Big[\sum_{j\in J_2}\Big(\sum_{c\in\mathbf{T}^{(j)}_{\geq a^j}} \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}^{(j)}}(c) - |\mathfrak{t}(\mathbf{L}_a^{j,\mathrm{ext}})|_{\mathfrak{s}}\Big)\Big] - \sum_{j\in J_1} |\mathfrak{t}\big(\mathbf{L}_a^{j,\mathrm{ext}}\big)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \\ &< \sum_{j\in J_2} |\mathfrak{s}|\Big[|\mathbf{L}_a^j| - \frac{1}{3}\Big] - \sum_{j\in J_1} |\mathfrak{t}\big(\mathbf{L}_a^{j,\mathrm{ext}}\big)|_{\mathfrak{s}} \,. \end{aligned} \tag{A.25}$$

In going to the second line of (A.25) we used, for each $j \in J_2$, (A.13) and the bound

$$-|\mathfrak{s}| + \mathbb{1}\big\{\mathbf{L}_a^j \not\ni \circledast\big\}\hbar_{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathbf{L}_a^{j,\mathrm{ext}}) < -\frac{|\mathfrak{s}|}{3} \,.$$

Using $\sum_{j\in J_2} |\mathbf{L}_a^j| = |\mathbf{L}_a| - |J_1|$, the RHS of (A.25) is strictly bounded above by $|\mathfrak{s}|\big[|\mathbf{L}_a| - \frac{1}{3}(|J_1| + |J_2|)\big]$, since $|J_2| + |J_1| \geq 2$ we are done.

We now treat the case $\mathbf{L}_a \ni \circledast$. Here $\mathbf{L}_a^j \ni \circledast$ for each $j \in [2p]$ and (A.13) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{b\in\mathbf{S}_{\geq a}} \tilde{\varsigma}_{\mathbf{S}}(b) &\leq \sum_{j\in J_2}\Big(\sum_{c\in\mathbf{T}^{(j)}_{\geq a^j}} \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}^{(j)}}(c) - |\mathfrak{t}(\mathbf{L}_a^{j,\mathrm{ext}})|_{\mathfrak{s}}\Big) \\ &< |\mathfrak{s}| \sum_{j\in J_2} (|\mathbf{L}_a^j| - 1) = |\mathfrak{s}|(|\mathbf{L}_a| - 1) \,. \end{aligned} \tag{A.26}$$

This completes the proof that the total homogeneity $\tilde{\varsigma}$ is subdivergence free on $\mathcal{V}$.

We now turn to showing (A.7) in our context. Suppose we are given $u \in \mathring{\mathbf{S}}$ satisfying both $u \leq (\mathcal{V}_*)^\uparrow$ and $\mathbf{S}_{\not\geq u} \neq \emptyset$. We define, for each $j \in [2p]$,

$$\mathbf{Q}_u^j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{X}^{(j)} \setminus \mathbf{L}_u \;\text{ and }\; J = \{j \in [2p] : \; \mathbf{Q}_u^j \neq \emptyset\} \,.$$

Clearly J is non-empty. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{w\in\mathbf{T}_{\not\geq u}} \tilde{\varsigma}_{\mathbf{S}}(w) - |\mathcal{V} \setminus \mathbf{L}_u|\,|\mathfrak{s}| \\ &\qquad \geq -\sum_{w\in\mathbf{T}_{\not\geq u}} \sum_{B\in\pi} \mathfrak{c}^B(w) + \sum_{j\in J}\Big[\sum_{w\in\mathbf{T}^{(j)}_{\not\geq u^j}} \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}^{(j)}}(w) - |\mathcal{X}^{(j)} \setminus \mathbf{L}_{u^j}|\,|\mathfrak{s}|\Big] \\ &\qquad \geq \sum_{j\in J}\Big[\sum_{w\in\mathbf{T}^{(j)}_{\not\geq u^j}} \varsigma_{\mathbf{T}^{(j)}}(w) - |\mathfrak{t}(\ell^{(j)} \setminus \mathbf{L}_u^j)|_{\mathfrak{s}} - |\mathcal{X}^{(j)} \setminus \mathbf{L}_{u^j}|\,|\mathfrak{s}|\Big] > \; 0 \,. \end{aligned}$$

In the final inequality, we also used (9.3) and, in going from the second to the third line, we used that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{w\in\mathbf{T}_{\not\geq u}}\sum_{B\in\pi}\mathfrak{c}^B(w) &= -\,|\mathfrak{t}(L^{\text{all}})|_{\mathfrak{s}} - \sum_{w\in\mathbf{T}_{\geq u}}\mathfrak{c}^B(w)\\ &\leq -\,|\mathfrak{t}(L^{\text{all}})|_{\mathfrak{s}} + |\mathfrak{t}(\mathbf{L}_u^{\text{ext}})|_{\mathfrak{s}} = -|\mathfrak{t}(L^{\text{all}}\setminus\mathbf{L}_u^{\text{ext}})|_{\mathfrak{s}}\ .\end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. □

Appendix B Symbolic index

In this appendix, we collect the most used symbols of the article, together with their meaning and the page where they were first introduced.

Symbol	Meaning	Page
$\bullet$	The trivial tree consisting only of a root.	10
$\mathbf{1}$	The empty forest. Not considered a tree.	10
$\mathfrak{L}$	Finite set of "types", used to distinguish each of the kernels and noises appearing in the system SPDE.	9
$\mathfrak{L}_+$	Set of $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{L}$ which are kernel types, satisfy $\lvert\mathfrak{t}\rvert_{\mathfrak{s}} > 0$.	10
$\mathfrak{L}_-$	Set of $\mathfrak{t} \in \mathfrak{L}$ which are leaf types, satisfy $\lvert\mathfrak{t}\rvert_{\mathfrak{s}} < 0$.	10
$\overline{\mathcal{A}}$	Set of maximal elements of the poset. $\mathcal{A}$	29
$\operatorname{Max}\mathcal{A}$	Set of maximal elements of the poset $\mathcal{A}$.	29
$\underline{\mathcal{A}}$	Set of minimal elements of the poset $\mathcal{A}$.	29
$\operatorname{Min}\mathcal{A}$	Set of minimal elements of the poset $\mathcal{A}$.	29
Div	All superficially divergent subtrees	29
$\mathfrak{C}$	All potentially useful cuts (edges).	40
$\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{M}}$	Collection of edges in $\mathfrak{C}$ which are not in any element of $\mathbb{M}$.	56
$\mathfrak{C}^P(\mathbb{M})$	Collection of cut sets $\mathscr{C}$ generating $\mathbb{M}$: $P_{\mathscr{C}}^{-1}[s(\mathbb{M})] = \mathbb{M}$.	55
$\mathfrak{M}^P(\mathscr{C})$	All forest intervals $\mathbb{M}$ generated by $\mathscr{C}$.	55
$P^{\mathbf{n}}$	Discards "dangerous" trees with respect to $\mathbf{n}$.	62
$\mathscr{G}^{\mathbf{n}}$	Kernel edges that benefit from cancellations.	64
$\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}$	Generic forests of subtrees.	29
$\mathbb{F}$	All forests of superficially divergent subtrees.	30
$\mathbb{F}^{\leq k}$	Forests in $\mathbb{F}$ of depth at most k.	30
$\mathbb{F}[\mathcal{F}]$	All forests $\mathcal{G}$ with $\operatorname{Max}\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}$.	30
$\mathbb{F}_<[\mathcal{F}]$	All $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq 1}$ with trees strictly contained in trees of $\mathcal{F}$.	30
$\mathbb{F}_\leq[\mathcal{F}]$	All $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F}^{\leq 1}$ with trees contained in trees of $\mathcal{F}$.	30
N_F	All nodes of the forest F.	10
E_F	All edges of the forest F.	10
$\mathbb{L}(F)$	Edges of noise type.	11
$K(F)$	Edges of kernel type.	11
$L(F)$	True nodes corresponding to $\mathbb{L}(F)$, inherits types.	11
$\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}]$	Intersection of all subtrees $\{\overline{T}_{\not\geq}(e) : e \in \operatorname{Min}(\mathscr{C})\}$	39
$N(F)$	True nodes: $N(F) = N_F \setminus e_{\mathrm{c}}(L(F))$.	11
N^*	True nodes of $\bar{T}$, plus $\circledast$.	27
$\circledast$	Node representing basepoint of the model.	27
$\tilde{N}(F)$	Defined as $\tilde{N}(F) = N(F) \setminus \varrho(F)$.	11

Symbol	Meaning	Page
$T_{\geq}(e)$	Subtree of T above the edge e (including e).	25
$T_{\not\geq}(e)$	Subtree of T formed by edges below or not comparable to the edge e.	25
$\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}]$	Intersection of all subtrees $\{\overline{T}_{\not\geq}(e) : e \in \text{Min}(\mathscr{C})\}$	39
$\mathfrak{T}_{\geq}[\mathscr{C}]$	Collection of maximal subtrees of $\overline{T}$ whose roots are of degree 1 and are edge disjoint $\overline{T}_{\not\geq}[\mathscr{C}]$.	39
$K^{\downarrow}(S)$	Kernel edges incoming to S (i.e. $e_{\mathfrak{p}} \in N_S$, $e_{\mathfrak{c}} \notin N_S$) in $\bar{T}$.	32
$\bar{K}^{\downarrow}(S)$	Defined as $K^{\downarrow}(S) \cup K(S)$.	32
$K^{\partial}_T(S)$	Defined for $T \leq S$ as $K^{\downarrow}(T) \cap K(S)$.	33
$N^{\downarrow}(S)$	Defined as $e_{\mathfrak{c}}(K^{\downarrow}(S))$.	32
$C_{\mathcal{F}}(S)$	Maximal elements of $\mathcal{F}$ restricted to subtrees of S.	30
$\tilde{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(S)$	Nodes in $\tilde{N}(S)$, but not in $\tilde{N}(T)$ for $T \in C_{\mathcal{F}}(S)$.	33
$N_{\mathcal{F}}(S)$	Defined as $\tilde{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(S) \cup \{\varrho_S\}$.	33
$\mathring{K}_{\mathcal{F}}(S)$	Kernel edges in S that neither belong to nor are adjacent to any subtree of $C_{\mathcal{F}}(S)$.	33
$K^{\partial}_{\mathcal{F}}(S)$	Union of $K^{\partial}_T(S)$ over $T \in C_{\mathcal{F}}(S)$.	33
$\ell(B)$	Gives power-counting gain for renormalization of $\mathbf{E}^c_{\mathfrak{t}(B)}$.	68
$\mathfrak{h}_{\mathfrak{c}}(B)$	Minimum homogeneity gain from some of the noises in B participating in "external" versus "internal" cumulants.	101
$\lvert\mathfrak{t}(B)\rvert_{\mathfrak{s}}$	Total homogeneity of the typed set B	10
$\lvert\mathfrak{t}(B)\rvert_{\mathfrak{s},\mathfrak{c}}$	minimum "internal" homogeneity given to noises B when participating in an external cumulant.	100
$\underline{\mathfrak{F}_2}$	Collection of all decorated i-forests.	23
$\underline{\mathfrak{T}_2}$	Collection of all decorated i-trees.	23
$\underline{\mathfrak{F}_i}$, $\underline{\mathfrak{T}_i}$	For $i \in \{0,1\}$, set of decorated i-forests or i-trees with color at most i.	23
$\widehat{\underline{\mathfrak{T}_2}}$	Collection of all decorated i-trees with root colored 2.	25
$L_{\mathcal{F}}(S)$	$e \in L(S)$ but not in $L(T)$ for every $T \in C_{\mathcal{F}}(S)$.	33
$\mathscr{C}(\mathbf{R}^d)$	Collection of smooth real valued functions on $\mathbf{R}^d$.	14
$\mathscr{C}_A$	All smooth real valued functions on $(\mathbf{R}^d)^A$.	27
$\mathscr{C}_*$	Collection of all smooth real valued functions on $(\mathbf{R}^d)^{N^*}$.	27
$\mathbf{X}^{N,v'}_{\mathfrak{n},v}$, etc.	Various notations for products of monomials or binomials in $\mathscr{C}_*$.	34
$H_{\pi,\mathcal{F},S}$	Renormalized distribution for divergent S.	36
$C_{\mathscr{C}}(e)$	For $e \in \mathfrak{C}$, $\mathscr{C} \subset \mathbb{C}_+$, given by $\text{Min}(\{\bar{e} \in \mathscr{C} : \bar{e} > e\})$.	39

References

[AT06] F. AVRAM and M. S. TAQQU. On a Szegö type limit theorem and the asymptotic theory of random sums, integrals and quadratic forms. In *Dependence in probability and statistics*, 259–286. Springer, 2006.

[BHZ16] Y. BRUNED, M. HAIRER, and L. ZAMBOTTI. Algebraic renormalisation of regularity structures. *ArXiv e-prints* (2016). arXiv:1610.08468.

[BP57] N. N. BOGOLIUBOW and O. S. PARASIUK. Über die Multiplikation der Kausalfunktionen in der Quantentheorie der Felder. *Acta Math.* **97**, (1957), 227–266. doi:10.1007/BF02392399.

[CQ02] L. COUTIN and Z. QIAN. Stochastic analysis, rough path analysis and fractional Brownian motions. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **122**, no. 1, (2002), 108–140. doi:10.1007/s004400100158.

[CS16] A. CHANDRA and H. SHEN. Moment bounds for SPDEs with non-Gaussian fields and application to the Wong-Zakai problem. *ArXiv e-prints* (2016). arXiv:1605.05683.

[FMRS85] J. FELDMAN, J. MAGNEN, V. RIVASSEAU, and R. SÉNÉOR. Bounds on Renormalized Feynman graphs. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **100**, no. 1, (1985), 23–55. doi:10.1007/BF01212686.

[FV10] P. FRIZ and N. VICTOIR. Differential equations driven by Gaussian signals. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* **46**, no. 2, (2010), 369–413. arXiv:0707.0313. doi:10.1214/09-AIHP202.

[GJ87] J. GLIMM and A. JAFFE. *Quantum physics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second ed., 1987. A functional integral point of view. doi:10.1007/978-1-4612-4728-9.

[Hai13] M. HAIRER. Solving the KPZ equation. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **178**, no. 2, (2013), 559–664. arXiv:1109.6811. doi:10.4007/annals.2013.178.2.4.

[Hai14] M. HAIRER. A theory of regularity structures. *Invent. Math.* **198**, no. 2, (2014), 269–504. arXiv:1303.5113. doi:10.1007/s00222-014-0505-4.

[Hai16] M. HAIRER. The motion of a random string. *ArXiv e-prints* (2016). arXiv:1605.02192.

[Hep69] K. HEPP. On the equivalence of additive and analytic renormalization. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **14**, (1969), 67–69. doi:10.1007/BF01645456.

[HHL+15] Y. HU, J. HUANG, K. LÊ, D. NUALART, and S. TINDEL. Stochastic heat equation with rough dependence in space. *ArXiv e-prints* (2015). arXiv:1505.04924.

[Hos16] M. HOSHINO. KPZ equation with fractional derivatives of white noise. *Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput.* 1–64. arXiv:1602.04570. doi:10.1007/s40072-016-0078-x.

[HQ15] M. HAIRER and J. QUASTEL. A class of growth models rescaling to KPZ. *ArXiv e-prints* (2015). arXiv:1512.07845.

[HS15] M. HAIRER and H. SHEN. A central limit theorem for the KPZ equation. *ArXiv e-prints* (2015). arXiv:1507.01237.

[MU11] J. MAGNEN and J. UNTERBERGER. From constructive field theory to fractional stochastic calculus. (I) An introduction: rough path theory and perturbative heuristics. *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **12**, no. 6, (2011), 1199–1226. arXiv:1012.3873. doi:10.1007/s00023-011-0106-3.

[MU12] J. MAGNEN and J. UNTERBERGER. From constructive field theory to fractional stochastic calculus. (II) Constructive proof of convergence for the Lévy area of fractional Brownian motion with Hurst index $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{4})$. *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **13**, no. 2, (2012), 209–270. arXiv:1103.1750. doi:10.1007/s00023-011-0119-y.

[SX16] H. SHEN and W. XU. Weak universality of dynamical Φ^4_3: non-Gaussian noise. *ArXiv e-prints* (2016). arXiv:1601.05724.

[Zim69] W. ZIMMERMANN. Convergence of Bogoliubov's method of renormalization in momentum space. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **15**, (1969), 208–234. doi:10.1007/BF01645676.